THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS
AND
THE BOOK OF ACTS

D. A. HAYES

B 69

David Stewart Mead.

August 22, 1955

OTHER WORKS BY D. A. HAYES

THE GIFT OF TONGUES
THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN
PAUL AND HIS EPISTLES
JOHN AND HIS WRITINGS
GREAT CHARACTERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
THE NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES

Biblical Introduction Series

The Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts

By

D. A. HAYES

Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology
Garrett Biblical Institute

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN

NEW YORK CINCINNATI

C. B. R. E.
604 Jarvis Street,
TORONTO.

Copyright, 1919, by
D. A. HAYES

Printed in the United States of America

First Edition Printed March, 1919
Reprinted December, 1923

TO

HENRY BUTLER SCHWARTZ

ONCE MY ROOMMATE
ALWAYS A MISSIONARY
FOR LONG THE WHOLE WHITE POPULATION
OF THE LU-CHU ISLANDS

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 11

PART I

"THE MOST IMPORTANT BOOK EVER WRITTEN"
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

I. SOME ESTIMATES OF THE FIRST GOSPEL 17

II. MATTHEW 19
1. His Name.
2. His Relationships.
3. His Biography.
4. Traditions Concerning Him.
5. The Man and His Character.
6. His Fitness for His Work.

III. THE BOOK AND SOME OF ITS CHARACTERISTICS 39
1. The Gospel for the Jews.
2. The Gospel of Fulfillment.
3. The Gospel of Righteousness.
4. The Gospel of the Kingdom.
5. The Gospel of Jesus the King.
6. The Gospel of Gloom.
7. The Official Gospel.
8. The Gospel of Hope for the Gentiles.
9. The Gospel of the Church.
10. The Gospel of the Publican.
11. The Gospel of Systematic Arrangement.
12. The Gospel of the Threes and Sevens.
13. The Gospel of Dreams.
14. The Gospel of the Five Great Discourses.
15. The Gospel of the Four Great Mountains.

IV. THE MAN AND THE BOOK 83

V. PECULIAR PORTIONS 88

VI. THE AIM OF THE GOSPEL 89

VII. THE GOSPEL'S AFFINITIES AMONG THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS 91

VIII. OUTLINE OF THE GOSPEL 93

IX. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING 95

PART II

THE MOST AUTHENTIC GOSPEL
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

PAGE

I. The Author 99
1. His Name.
2. Facts of His Life.
3. His Character.
4. Traditions Concerning Him.

II. Traditions as to the Writing of the Gospel 119

III. Characterizations of the Gospel 125
1. The Gospel for the Latin Peoples.
2. The Gospel of the Strenuous Life.
3. The Gospel of Repeated Retirements.
4. The Gospel of Vivid Description.
5. The Disciple Gospel.
6. Peter's Gospel.
7. The Gospel of the Strong Son of God.
8. The Gospel of Service.

IV. Noteworthy Additions to the Gospel Narrative 155

V. The Style of the Gospel 158

VI. The Most Authentic and Authoritative Gospel 159

VII. The Appendix to the Second Gospel, Mark 16. 9–20 .. 164

PART III

"THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN"
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

I. The Author 177
1. The New Testament Data.
2. The Name "Luke."
3. Luke, the Companion of Paul.
4. Luke, the Physician.
5. Luke, the Musician.
6. Luke, the Artist.
7. Luke, the Gentile.
8. Luke, Citizen of Antioch.
9. Luke, the Freedman.
10. Luke in Later Tradition.
11. An Outline Biography.

II. Sources of the Gospel 199

III. Date of the Gospel 202

IV. Place of Writing 204

PAGE

V. Characterizations of the Gospel 205
1. The Gospel for the Gentiles.
2. The Gospel of an Educated Man.
3. The Gospel of the Physician.
4. The Gospel of Childhood.
5. The Gospel of Womanhood.
6. The Gospel for the Poor.
7. The Gospel for the Outcasts.
8. The Pauline Gospel.
9. The Gospel of Jesus, our Brother-Man.
10. The Gospel of Praise.

VI. The Gospel and the Man Luke 264

PART IV
THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

I. Definitions 269
II. Resemblances 270
III. Differences 276
IV. Responsibilities 283
V. Aids 286
VI. Theories 289
VII. Conclusions 294

PART V
THE BOOK OF ACTS

I. Name of the Book 303
1. The Acts of Peter and Paul.
2. The Acts of the Ascended Lord.
3. The Acts of the Holy Spirit.
4. The Acts of the Missionary Church.
5. The Acts of the Methodist Church.

II. Importance of the Book 311
1. As a Church History.
2. As a Help to Faith.
3. As a Manual of Revivals.
4. As a Biography of Paul.

III. Noticeable Features of the Book 318
1. Omissions.
2. Parallelisms.
3. Accuracy.

IV. Author and Sources of Information 333

Bibliography 337
Indexes 343

FOREWORD

So many volumes have been published in this field that it may seem a work of supererogation to add to the list. Our only excuse for doing so is that we have made a new presentation and arrangement of the existing material, and that we have attempted to give it added interest and life by joining with it a study of the personalities of the writers involved and of the influence of their personalities upon their books. As far as we know, this has not been done before in the same manner or to the same degree.

One of the writer's students gave a series of lectures in a Western college upon Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and he reports that at the end of the course the president of the school thanked him for them and said: "Do you know, I never more than half believed before that those evangelists were real men! Now they will be living personalities for me." That has been one aim in this and the preceding volumes—to give added interest to the study of the New Testament books, because in them we were able to see the manifested characters of the men who wrote them, and to realize that however little we might know of these authors, they yet were not mere shadows or myths, but real men with real messages taken out of their own real experience in life. Too many people have only half believed that these authors were real men, and for that reason they may have found themselves only half interested in their writings.

We may claim whatever added interest there may be in a study of the New Testament books from the standpoint of the personalities of their authors as the differentiating characteristic of these volumes on New Testament

Introduction. At least they attempt to introduce both the writers and the books. Therefore we called the first volume Paul and His Epistles, and the second John and His Writings; and in this volume we combine the study of the men Matthew, Mark, and Luke, with the study of their books. Behind each of these writings we have found and have attempted to point out a living man whose personal experience and individual character were manifest in and through his written words. Every book is likely to be in some measure an autobiography. The books discussed in this volume are continuously suggestive of personal traits.

There are those who deny that the Gospels were written by any of the men with whose names they are connected now, and to such people our method will seem wholly aside from the mark. There are others who so stress the original sources and so divide up the existing Gospels among these sources, and then add to them such an indefinite number of editors and revisers as largely, if not wholly, to lose sight of any single personality in connection with them. Yet the Gospels themselves persist in maintaining such individuality of character and such unity of style and composition as to belie all attempts to partition them among many hands. One man has put his stamp upon each, and from however many sources he may have compiled his material, and however many editors and revisers may have made minor changes in his work, the single personality still dominates each book and makes it worthy to be called by his name.

We agree with Peake when he says concerning the second Gospel: "In the case of all the synoptists they are corroborated by unbroken tradition, and no plausible reason can be suggested why Mark should have been chosen for the authorship of this Gospel if he had no hand in it. . . . It is of course possible that the second Gospel is the work of a later writer incorporating an earlier work of Mark, as Von Soden and Schürer think, but the uniformity of style makes it more probable that we have to do with the same author

throughout." [1] What he says of the Gospel according to Mark seems to us to be equally true of the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke.

We agree with Zahn when he asserts, "An oral tradition which was accepted so early and so universally by friend and foe alike, as was the tradition that the Gospels used by the church were written by the apostles Matthew and John, and by Mark and Luke, the disciples of the apostles, must have arisen from actual facts, because there is nothing in the books themselves which would necessarily have given rise to the unanimous tradition regarding their authors," [2] and again: "It follows, therefore, that the tradition associated with the four Gospels from the time when they began to circulate, and which was not attacked during the entire period from 70-170 even by hostile critics, of whom these books had no lack even at this early date, is based, not upon learned conjectures, but upon facts which at that time were incontrovertible." [3]

Of course the titles to our Gospels were not affixed by the authors themselves, but, as Henry Latimer Jackson has said: "Those who prefixed the titles regarded, and meant to indicate, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as authors of the works which set forth the one Gospel. . . . The tradition of the names of the authors comes to us from a very early time, and it would be uncritical to abandon an early and continuous tradition of this kind, unless good reason could be given for doing so." [4] Such good reason thus far has not been produced by the most strenuous effort of the most venturesome criticism. Therefore, we have proceeded upon the basis of the trustworthiness of the traditional ascription of authorship in these books and our own studies have tended to establish this trustworthiness only the more firmly

[1] Peake, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament, p. 121.
[2] Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii, p. 391.
[3] Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 392.
[4] Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 427.

in our own faith. These men speak too plainly through their writings for anyone to fail to recognize their voices unless his ears already are filled with the din of the mutually destructive contentions of chronic criticism. When the books are allowed to speak for themselves their testimony seems clear.

It remains only to say that most of the material found in the discussion of the third Gospel and of the synoptic problem already has appeared in print and is reproduced in revised form in this volume with the permission of the publishers. It is in the hope that the readers of this book will find it a real help in their study of the synoptic Gospels and the book of Acts that we now send it out with the prayer that it may increase the knowledge of and the reverence for and the delight in this portion of the New Testament revelation of the grace of our God.

PART I

"THE MOST IMPORTANT BOOK EVER WRITTEN": THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

PART I

"THE MOST IMPORTANT BOOK EVER WRITTEN": THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

I. Some Estimates of the First Gospel

1. Renan said that the Gospel according to Matthew was "the most important book of Christendom, *the most important book which has ever been written.*" [1]

2. We find this conclusion confirmed by a more recent authority. Jülicher, in his Introduction to the New Testament, says: "Certainly, Matthew has become *the most important book ever written.* . . . It has exerted its enormous influence upon the church because it was written by a man who bore within himself the spirit of the growing Church Universal, and who, free from all party interests, knew how to write a catholic Gospel; that is to say, a Gospel destined and fitted for all manner of believers." [2]

3. This catholicity of its spirit has impressed a still more recent writer, and has led him to a similar conclusion concerning the relative importance of this Gospel. Von Soden declares, "It points onward to the development toward catholicism; hence it became the chief Gospel, the work which took the lead in guiding this development, and in so far *no book ever written is of greater historical importance.*" [3] Others have spoken in equally unmeasured terms of praise of this book.

4. Zahn declares: "In greatness of conception, and in the

[1] Les Evangiles, p. 212.

[2] Jülicher, Einleitung, p. 314.

[3] Von Soden, History of Early Christian Literature, p. 199.

power with which a mass of material is subordinated to great ideas, no writing in either Testament, dealing with a historical theme, is to be compared with Matthew. In this respect the present writer would be at a loss to find its equal also in the other literature of antiquity." [4]

5. Keim, after calling our first Gospel "a grand old granitic book," says that we find in it "the simple grandeur of monumental writing, antique history, immeasurably effective because it is nature itself, because it does not aim at being effective." [5]

6. Dean Farrar repeats this in a characteristic paragraph. He declares that "the book carries with it internal evidence of its own sacredness. How could the unlettered Galilæan publican have written unaided a book so 'immeasurably effective'? How could he have sketched out a tragedy which, by the simple divineness of its theme, dwarfs the greatest of all earthly tragedies? How could he have composed a Passion music which, from the flutelike strains of its sweet overture to the 'multitudinous chorale' of its close, accumulates with unflagging power the mightiest elements of pathos and of grandeur? Why would the world lose less from the loss of Hamlet, and the Divina Commedia, and the Paradise Lost together, than from the loss of this brief book of the despised Galilæan? Because this book is due not to genius, but to revelation; not to art, but to truth.

"The words of the man are nothing, save as they are the record of the manifestation of God. The greatness of the work lay, not in the writer, but in Him of whom he wrote; and in this, that without art, without style, without rhetoric, in perfect and unconscious simplicity, he sets forth the facts as they were. He is 'immeasurably effective' because he nowhere aims at effectiveness. He thought of nothing less. Though we find in his book the 'simple grandeur of monumental writing,' he brought to his work but three intellec-

[4] Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii, p. 556.

[5] Keim, Jesus of Nazara, i, p. 73.

tual endowments: the love of truth, an exquisite sensibility to the mercy of God and the misery of man, and a deep sense of that increasing purpose which runs through the ages. And thus endowed by the Holy Spirit of God, he has given us this unique History, so genuinely human, and therefore, in all its parts, so genuinely divine; a mighty, because a simply truthful, record of the words and deeds of Him who was both God and man." [6]

We may not be ready to agree with any of these estimates, taken as a whole, and yet they may be sufficient to convince us that the Gospel according to Matthew is a most notable book, according to the judgment of most able and competent authorities, a book worthy of our study in any detail, and a book whose author must have been a most notable man. All ancient times agreed that the author was Matthew, and all modern efforts to disprove the unanimous testimony of antiquity have fallen far short of conclusiveness. Therefore we begin our study with some notice of this man.

II. Matthew

1. *His Name.* His name was Levi, לֵוִי; but this original Hebrew name, recorded in Mark 2. 14 and Luke 5. 27, seems to have been replaced after his call into the discipleship of Jesus with the new name "Matthew," Ματθαῖος, from the Hebrew מַתָּאִי or מַתִּתְיָה, equivalent to the Greek Θεόδωρος, Theodore or Theodoretus or Dorotheus or Adeodatus, and meaning "the gift of Jehovah," or "the gift of God."

At the time of his call Simon was given his new name Cephas or Peter,[7] and this new name displaced the old in the usage and memory of the Christian Church. Saul, the greatest persecutor of the early church, became the greatest apostle in that church; and the church came to know him by a new name, Paul. Here is another apostle to whom a new

[6] Messages of the Books, pp. 47, 48.

[7] John 1. 42.

name is given as he enters the apostolate; and the new name has so far displaced the old that the old name is well-nigh forgotten in the church of to-day. It is fitting that the first book of our canon of the New Covenant, the first book of our New Testament, should be written by a man with a new name. This is not a Levitical revelation, a Gospel according to Levi. That belonged to the Old Testament. This is the Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel of the new name to be given to every Christian,[8] the Gospel according to the new Gift of God. Our New Testament is begun by this man with the new name.

2. *His Relationships.* (1) In Mark 2. 14 we read that Levi was the son of Alphæus. In Mark 3. 18, in the list of the apostles, Matthew's name occurs, followed by that of Thomas and then by that of James the Less; and James is said to be the son of Alphæus. If this Alphæus is the same as the one mentioned in the preceding chapter, it follows that Matthew and James the Less were brothers. This relationship seems probable, at least. In Mark 15. 40 Mary is said to be the mother of James the Less. Mary then is the mother of Matthew.

(2) We notice that in Mark's list of the apostles the name of Thomas comes between the names of these two brothers. We notice further that in all of the synoptical lists of the apostles[9] the names of Matthew and Thomas are joined to form the fourth pair; and of the three preceding pairs we know that two, Peter and Andrew, and James and John, were paired because they were brothers. We find, again, that in John 11. 16 and 21. 2, Thomas is called Didymus or The Twin. Why was he called The Twin? Whose twin was he? It lies at hand to say that he was Matthew's twin brother. Then we understand why he always is named with Matthew in the synoptical lists, and why his name should follow that of Matthew and precede that of James, who

[8] Rev. 2. 17.

[9] Mark 3. 18; Matt. 10. 3; Luke 6. 15.

was Matthew's brother. Thomas was the brother of James the Less and the twin brother of Matthew; and therefore he was called Thomas Didymus, or Thomas the Twin. Then three of the twelve apostles were own brothers, Matthew, Thomas, and James the Less; and two of these were twin brothers, Matthew and Thomas Didymus.[10]

It may be that we have not yet exhausted the possible relationships suggested for Matthew in the New Testament. (3) In Mark 15. 40 we read that among the women beholding the crucifixion were "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the Less and of Joses, and Salome." In John 19. 25 we find it stated that "there were standing by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene." Was the mother of James the Less and of Matthew this sister of the mother of Jesus? Church tradition said that Matthew was a kinsman of Jesus.[11] Could it be that Matthew's mother was Mary's sister, and that Matthew and Jesus were cousins? This does not seem to us very probable. We will be content to believe that it is possible that Alphæus was the father of Matthew, and Mary his mother, and Thomas his twin brother, and James the Less his younger brother, and that Joses was a brother possibly younger still.

It is just possible that "Joses" was another name for "Thomas." He may have had two names as well as Matthew. It is barely possible that Mary the mother of Jesus had a sister named Mary who was the mother of these three or four boys. But the likelihood that there were two sisters both named Mary is so precarious that we do not give it much credence. If these brothers were not cousins of Jesus, they were his fellow townsmen at Capernaum. They probably were well acquainted with Jesus and his family, as well as with those other brother-pairs, Peter and Andrew, and James and John. With these they must have

[10] So Weiss concludes, Leben Jesu, vol. ii, pp. 80, 81.

[11] Farrar, The Messages of the Books, p. 29.

formed a very compact group of friends and fellow townsmen in the apostolate.

3. *His Biography.* The New Testament tells us nothing more about Matthew except the account of his call and the feast in connection with it.[12] Save in the apostolic lists his name never occurs again in the sacred book. All we know of him we must gather from these short paragraphs. Since our sources of information are so meager, we will look at these paragraphs in detail. We notice first Matthew's own account of his call. "And as Jesus passed by from thence, he saw a man, called Matthew, sitting at the place of toll: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him." [13]

With the simplicity and the brevity characteristic of these Gospels the whole of this wonderful narrative is crowded into these two sentences—"Jesus saw the publican Matthew, and said to him, Follow me," and "Matthew the publican left all and followed him." What a simple transaction that seems to be, and yet what a marvelous occurrence it really was! No wonder that Matthew makes it, even though it be in this very abbreviated form, a matter of record in his Gospel, for it is the very heart of the Gospel to him. The moment set before us here was the crisis moment of his life. It meant moral redemption to him; it meant eternal salvation to him; it meant everything to him. It was the moment of decision between light and darkness, life and death, heaven and hell. His immortal destiny for one moment hung wavering. A divine voice came crashing in upon his soul, unexpectedly, in the very midst of his business. For a moment he may have been bewildered, hesitant; or there may not have been even a moment's delay. He rose to his feet, cast one swift glance around upon his belongings, deliberately turned his back upon them; and leaving all his chances of worldly preferment and all his sinful past behind him, he faced toward

[12] Matt. 9. 9-19; Mark 2. 14-22; Luke 5. 27-39.
[13] Matt. 9. 9.

Jesus and followed after him. That was all, but that was everything. Matthew followed the Lord through life, through death, and through the infinite heights of heaven. He sits on one of the twelve thrones there to-day.

Let us look at this Jew as he sits there at the place of toll, while Jesus is approaching him, coming down the Capernaum road toward the tax-receiver's booth. Matthew is a man of strong personal character, capable of standing alone if need be against all the popular tides of the time. For financial or other reasons he has chosen to cut himself off from his people, and to ally himself with the hated and despised class of publicans or taxgatherers, many of them the tools of the foreigners, the representatives of the Roman conquerors, hated more than the Romans themselves because they were renegade Jews, traitors to the cause of home rule, political apostates instead of patriots. Matthew himself is in the employ of Herod Antipas; and his place of toll stands at the point where the great Damascus road enters the territory of Herod, at the northern end of the Sea of Galilee. He sits there at his desk with firm-set mouth and gloomy brow; and his fellow-countrymen come to pay their unwilling tribute, cursing the rule of Herod Antipas in their hearts and utterly despising this Jew who has so far forgotten his loyalty to his own nation as to lend himself to the oppressor's aid. They treat him with the contempt they feel he deserves; and Matthew, as stiff-necked and proud-hearted as they, resents their demeanor and exacts the last farthing of tribute they owe.

It was something like the state of affairs in the American colonies when they were preparing for the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution. The Stamp Act had been passed by the English Parliament; and it was to go into effect on the first day of November, 1765. All the colonies were aroused into intense indignation; and they declared that taxation without representation was tyranny unendurable. When the first day of November arrived, an

excited mob of patriots surrounded the house of the acting-governor of New York, Cadwalleder Colden, and demanded that he deliver up to them all the stamped paper forwarded him from England in preparation for the levying of the tax; but Cadwalleder Colden had a will of his own. He was there as the servant and the representative of the king, and he refused to accede to their demand. Then all the hatred of the mob vented itself upon him, and they hung him in effigy and they burned his fine coach near the present Bowling Green and they threw the effigy into the bonfire. It must have been something of the same feeling which the intensely patriotic Jews cherished toward such men as Matthew, the taxgatherers of the tyranny against which the whole nation was ripening for revolt.

It was something as if, on Sherman's march to the sea, when the Union troops had taken possession of a town, some Southerner, born and bred in the South, had suddenly espoused the cause of the Federal troops, had opened his house for the entertainment of the officers, and had assisted in foraging expeditions and had made himself officious in pointing out the place where there were hidden and abundant supplies. The Southerners would have hated the Yankee soldiers in all probability; but their intensest hatred would have been reserved for their renegade brother, who ought to have stood with them but who had chosen to ally himself with the enemy instead. They would have felt like treating him to a coat of tar and feathers and riding him out of town on a rail as soon as the troops were gone. Can we imagine some Belgian currying favor with the German conquerors in Antwerp and giving them his assistance and service in the collection of the taxes imposed upon his countrymen? Can we imagine how the Belgian patriots would regard such a man? In the same way the Jewish publican was a turncoat, a political apostate, a renegade, a traitor; and his hand was against every man and every man's hand was against him.

It was a hard life the Jewish publican led. He was a lawbreaker by the very necessities of his occupation, an outcast from his people, an alien to his own nation, a professional Sabbath-breaker with the Gentiles, and yet a Jew. He was despised by those whom he served and despised still more by those whom he helped to oppress. He often must have wished to be free from his task, since every day was so filled with annoyances and unpleasantnesses; but there was no hope of release. The publican had crossed the Rubicon, and there was no turning back. The shadow of his crime rested heavily upon him henceforth through life. He was banished from his brethren, socially, politically, religiously ostracized by them as long as he lived.

However, strange things had been happening here in Capernaum. One of Matthew's fellow townsmen had begun to show himself very different from his neighbors in everything. He was different from them in spirit and life, in speech and behavior. He was full of love, instead of hate; full of gentleness, forbearance, forgiveness, instead of haughtiness, exclusiveness, and contempt. He had a place in his heart for the weary and the heavy-laden, the publican and the sinner, the outcast and the lost; and he was a man of mighty power. He had opened blind eyes and restored palsied limbs. He had done more than that; he had cured the leprosy, and that was an incurable disease. The fame of these things had spread through the land. The population of Capernaum was amazed beyond measure, and they said, "We never saw it on this fashion; what new thing is this which has appeared in our midst?"

Matthew had been amazed with the rest. He had heard of these wonders; and he may have seen some of them with his own eyes. He doubtless had listened to this fellow townsman and his heart had been impressed with the conviction that this man spake as never man spake before him and that he had in him a power and an authority which were divine. He had sat there at the place of toll day

after day and had pondered these things within him; and he had chafed under the heavy burden of his nation's reprobation which his self-chosen occupation had imposed upon him; and he had heartily wished himself free from it all. He even had wondered if this gospel of Jesus of Nazareth might not be for him; if, in following this new Teacher, he might not find his way back into happiness and peace and heaven. It may have been weeks or months that he had been under conviction, the certainty growing within him that this Jesus could give him all his heart desired; and to-day, as he looked down the road and saw the Wonder-worker approaching, his heart beat fast with vague anticipation, for somehow or other he felt that the crisis of his life had come.

A publican who was passing by may have halted for one moment at the booth and said to him: "Matthew, have you heard the latest news? This Jesus has been teaching up here in the town; and a great multitude thronged the whole house where he was. There were Pharisees and doctors of divinity all the way from Jerusalem and out of every town of Galilee and Judæa, such a crowd as Capernaum has not seen in many a day; and four friends brought a man sick of the palsy and stretched out at full length on his couch, in the hope that this Jesus might heal him. They could not get in; the house was packed close, and the doorways were jammed full of the people; and what did they do but climb up to the roof and make a hole in the tiling and let the palsied man down from above with ropes! You ought to have seen the astonishment of the crowd inside; the doctors of divinity all frowned at this unusual procedure.

"Jesus looked at the man in all calmness imaginable, and told him that his sins were forgiven him. Then a murmur of indignation ran round the whole circle of scribes and Pharisees and doctors, and they all said that that was pure blasphemy; but the Teacher turned on them, and his eyes flashed a little as he smiled in his own quiet way, and he

said to them, 'You do not believe me when I tell you that this man's sins are forgiven him; would you believe me if I said to you that his strength was restored? I will compel your faith that far at least. You must believe what your own eyes see for themselves.' Then he said to the palsied man, 'Rise up, and walk!' and the palsied man stood up and took his bed on his back, and the crowds parted before him as they would have shrunk away from a ghost, and he walked away through them and went straight to his home! And the people are all saying, 'Israel never saw anything like it before; we believe that this man can do anything he says he can do, even to the forgiveness of sins.' "

Matthew listened, and in the depths of his own heart he said: "I believe. He can forgive sins. The power of God is with him. I wish I could be with him too." Then he heard the commotion of the multitude approaching down the road, and he looked out and saw the Master at the head of the throng; and there was an unutterable longing within him to cut loose from this business and to leave all his past life behind him forever, and there was a vague yearning for something better and higher, something nobler and more satisfying; and it was all apparent in his eager face, as he saw the Master coming up and going by. The Master saw him; and he paused for one moment and looked into the depths of this man's heart through the depths of his eye, and he saw that this heart was prepared for apostleship. Then the Master said, "Matthew, follow me!" And Matthew arose, left all, and followed him. The die was cast; the decision was made for time and for eternity. That was the beginning of lifelong discipleship and then of eternal beatitude. Matthew follows the Master to-day.

Do we realize how wonderful it was, not that Matthew followed the Lord, but that the Lord asked Matthew to follow him? It was putting his then popular cause under the popular ban. If he added to his intimate associates a publican, a taxgatherer, a renegade, an apostate, making

him one of the apostolic twelve, it would arouse inevitably the prejudice of the whole Jewish nation against him, and it would endanger seriously the success of his cause. Our Lord never paid any attention to the maxims of merely worldly wisdom. He looked only at the heart, and he cared nothing for the past history. He was absolutely indifferent to antecedents, external connections, or social position. All that he asked was the faith which would follow him.

Matthew had that faith, and that settled the matter with Jesus. All disciples looked alike to him. They all looked good to him, if they were good disciples. If they were ready to obey and follow his command, he asked nothing about their past occupation or their present social standing. God was no respecter of persons. In the kingdom of God which he had come to proclaim religious privileges were to be free to all alike. Rich and poor, Pharisee and publican, priest and prostitute were equally welcome. They must come in on the same terms and then they could share and share alike.

In all probability Matthew thoroughly understood this attitude of the Master, for he immediately determined to celebrate the close of his career as a publican and the beginning of his new life as a disciple with a great feast in his own home, and he invited all of his old friends to this feast, all the publicans and the sinners of the town!

Most likely Jesus never had seen so many disreputable characters, brought together under one roof and sitting at one table, before; but he did not hesitate one moment to take his place at the table with them. It was one of the happiest occasions of his life. Here was a disciple capable of a whole-hearted surrender of everything to the cause; and his house and all his resources were placed at the Master's disposal to-day. Here was a company of social outcasts, hungry of heart and eager for help some of them, and all of them needing the assurance of the Father's love and of the Great Physician's ability and willingness to heal them of their hurt.

There across the table was a man of evil countenance, bent only upon gorging himself with all the good things placed within his reach. Could a word be spoken to that glutton which would arouse him to some perception of higher things? There at the far end of the line was that woman of the gaudy raiment and the painted face and the painfully conciliating smile. Surely she had a good heart, hidden behind that courtesan exterior. Surely she was capable of great devotion; she could love, if she had a chance, if she ever found any man who was not a beast.

It was such an opportunity as Jesus constantly coveted. He reclined at the table and quietly talked about the good things of the Kingdom and the manifold proof of the Father's immeasurable love. At last every eye was fastened upon him and every ear was attentive to his speech. At last the hard hearts began to throb with new hope, even while the flush of shame mounted into faces long unused to blushing but accustomed to brazening it out in the sight of the world.

Jesus talked on; and the glutton stopped swilling his wine and listened until he loathed himself and all his past life, and he said to his own soul: "I am one of the swine, and I have lived swinishly all my days. I have given most of my thought to my meat and my drink; but here is a man whose meat and whose drink it is to do the will of the Father who sent him. Other men have despised me and called me a sot. This man does not hesitate to cast his pearls before me, even though he must have seen at this very table that I sat among the swine and was fain to fill myself with the swine's meat. In the presence of his temperance I come to myself. I realize that I am capable of better, much better, things. I will arise and come to this Father of whom he speaks. Henceforth I will seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness as long as I live." Jesus saw the light of a new manhood suddenly flash into that man's eye, and his soul rejoiced at the sight.

He talked on, and a hush fell upon the whole assembly, and many held their breath in tense expectation, for it seemed that God and heaven had drawn very near. That woman who was a sinner burst into sobbing, and the hot tears plowed their way as through furrows of paint down her cheeks. She hid her face in her mantle and there she vowed within her own soul: "I will take all my ill-gotten gains and I will purchase with them an alabaster cruse of precious ointment; and I will watch my opportunity and some time I will pour it all out at his feet. It will be my inexpressible libation to Purity, incarnate in him and enthroned henceforth in my heart. It will be the symbol of my infinite abhorrence of the past and my uttermost devotion to the pure and the good. He will not refuse the gift. He will not spurn it as the product of tainted wealth. He will accept it as his due. He will love me freely, even as the Father loves. He will forgive my many sins, and I will go in peace to live a life which is pure and clean."

Jesus saw the tears, and his soul rejoiced in the sight; and he said: "Repentance and faith are all He requires to enter in. Matthew has begun the new life to-day, and he celebrates the event with this feast. He has left all to follow me; and he invites you, all of you, to join with him in this new allegiance. This house is the very sanctuary of the Most High. To-day it has become the birthplace of souls. This feast may be a foretaste of the marriage supper of the Lamb, for the Bridegroom is here, and in more than one soul the bride is making herself ready."

It was indeed a joyous occasion. It would have been difficult to tell who was happiest in that company: Jesus, who rejoiced to see that the Father was being glorified through his message; or the souls who were looking for the first time into the Father's reconciled face; or Matthew, whose heart's desire was being accomplished in the homage paid to his Master and in the salvation of his friends. Probably Matthew was as happy as anybody else that day. However,

there were some people who were not particularly pleased. Certain Pharisees complained to his disciples, "Why eateth your Master with the publicans and sinners?" To them Jesus answered: "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. Do you find any fault with a physician because he goes wherever his professional practice may call him? Would you not rather find fault with him if he refused to go to minister to the physical needs of anybody here? I too have a professional interest in these people. I minister to sick souls as the physician ministers to sick bodies. I have the same right to associate with them which he has. The well should not complain that the physician visits the sick."

Then he turned upon them with one of his favorite quotations from the Scripture. He said, "Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice: for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." [14] Matthew heard, and his heart leaped within him as he knew his old enemies so well answered and the Master's mission to himself and his friends so clearly proclaimed and vindicated before all the people.

Then some of the disciples of John the Baptist came and said in their turn: "What does all this feasting mean? It is not these people *with whom* he feasts to whom we object, but it is the feasting itself. *Our* master taught us to fast, and the Pharisees fast oft. It seems to us that if Matthew is about to begin a religious life, he would do well to begin with fasting rather than feasting. That would be much more in accordance with the spirit and the program of John."

Now, Matthew in all probability never had been a disciple of John the Baptist and, even if he had been among the publicans who came to John asking to be baptized,[15] he had prepared this feast of celebration and farewell without any

[14] Matt. 9. 13.
[15] Luke 3. 12.

thought of the Forerunner. However, he knew that Jesus had been baptized of John and that he thought very highly of that ascetic of the wilderness. Peter and Andrew and James and John and Philip and Bartholomew all had been disciples of John the Baptist before they became disciples of Jesus. Both they and Matthew listened with great eagerness to hear what the Master would have to say.

The answer of Jesus was a most memorable one. Matthew never forgot it. It seemed to him to sum up the whole relation between the new gospel and the old dispensation. It influenced his conception of Christianity to the day of his death. It determined all unconsciously to himself the form which his written Gospel would take in the later days. He listened, and many things grew clear to him as he heard the Master say, "Can the sons of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast. And no man putteth a piece of undressed cloth upon an old garment; for that which should fill it up taketh from the garment, and a worse rent is made. Neither do men put new wine into old wineskins: else the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins perish: but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins, and both are preserved." [16]

While Jesus was speaking, Jairus came in, and told Jesus his daughter had just died; and Jesus rose to go with him to the stricken home. Thus the company broke up, and the feast ended. Matthew went with the Lord; and he followed him henceforth as a disciple, and later as an apostle. He was present, of course, on many or most of the occasions deemed worthy of record in our Gospels; but aside from the apostolical lists his name never is found again on their pages.

He belongs in the second group of the apostles. Peter, James, John, and Andrew form the first group, and are

[16] Matt. 9. 15-17.

most prominent in the gospel history. Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, and Thomas form the second group of four; and of the other three in this group we hear again, and of some of them on several occasions. Matthew alone has no other mention in our New Testament. He was a publican who became an apostle. At the time of his call he gave a feast in honor of his new Master and invited his old friends. That is all we are told about him in the Scripture, and it may seem like a small basis upon which to build any sure conception of his character. Before making the attempt we notice what church tradition has to say of him.

4. *Traditions Concerning Him.* (1) Clement of Alexandria wrote a manual of moral behavior for the early Christians, and in the chapter "On Eating" he says: "Happiness is found in the practice of virtue. Accordingly, the apostle Matthew partook of seeds, and nuts, and vegetables, without flesh." [17] Was this because Matthew remembered that the Master had said at his feast, "It is all right to feast now; but when the bridegroom is taken away my disciples will fast"? Were his abstinence and his vegetarianism a constant memorial of his faithfulness to every suggestion of his Lord?

(2) In another of his larger works Clement of Alexandria has preserved one saying of the apostle Matthew. His language is as follows: "They say in the traditions that Matthew the apostle constantly said, that 'if the neighbor of an elect man sin, the elect man has sinned. For had he conducted himself as the Word prescribes, his neighbor also would have been filled with such reverence for the life he led as not to sin.' " [18]

There is a deal of truth in this saying. No Christian can shake off all responsibility for the sin of the community in which he lives. He dare not say: "It is no affair of mine. I have nothing to do with it." The chances are, as Matthew

[17] Paedag. II, 1. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. ii, p. 241.

[18] Strom. VII, 13. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. ii, p. 547.

said, that if his life were just what it ought to be, it would convict his neighbor of sin and righteousness and judgment, and bring him to repentance and faith. When all Christians are ideal Christians it will not be long before the world will be saved. For all delay in that blessed consummation the Christian Church is, and always will be, most largely responsible.

On the other hand, things being as they are to-day, the holiest life will not be uniformly successful in evangelism. Jesus himself did not bring all to believe. He conducted himself as God's Word prescribed, and yet some of his neighbors continued to sin. *He* was without sin, nevertheless. His ever-faithful testimony absolved him from all responsibility for their guilt. We are disposed to conclude, then, that this saying of Matthew is not literally true, while, like most paradoxes, it is suggestive of truth and most provocative of thought.

(3) Later tradition affirms that Matthew spent some fifteen years in Judæa after the crucifixion and then was sent to Ethiopia as an apostolic evangelist.[19] Here we infer that he died a natural death. The Gospels tell us about Matthew's call and his farewell feast, and nothing more. Clement of Alexandria tells us one fact concerning him, and one of his sayings. All later tradition is uncertain and possibly unreliable.

This is all, therefore, that we know about Matthew, except (4) that all early church tradition unites in declaring that he was responsible for the compilation or the composition of our first Gospel. That alone has made Matthew immortal. As Dean Farrar has said: "Out of this life, so discredited in its youth, so unrecorded in its manhood, there flowed a most memorable service—the first Gospel . . . It is not the only instance in which one who seems to have lived much alone with God and his own soul has, like John Tauler or Thomas à Kempis, embalmed in one brief book

[19] Socrates, Hist. Eccles., i, 19.

the inmost fragrance of a blessed spirit, to last for a life beyond life." [20]

Now, upon the basis of the facts in hand, what conclusions may we safely draw concerning this man and his character?

5. *The Man and His Character.* (1) He was a Jew, with the training of a Jew, and with the ineradicable consciousness of his racial prerogatives and relationships. He was as well acquainted with the Old Testament as the average Jew, and as conversant with all the Messianic hopes and promises.

(2) He was a renegade Jew, having broken with his race in becoming a publican. There must have been something of bitterness in his spirit, as the inevitable result of such action. He must have soured somewhat in his disposition. It is not in human nature to bear the scorn of a community and the odium of continuous contempt and the burden of social ostracism with undisturbed equanimity of temper. One tends to react into bitterness and pessimism and gloom. We would expect Matthew to show an element of sternness in his dealings with his proud and haughty persecutors among the Jews.

(3) On the other hand, Matthew the publican might be expected to be more friendly with the other publicans and the harlots and all the social outcasts, and even with the dogs of Gentiles, than the ordinary Jew ever came to be. He was more liberal than the most of his race. He was a man of broad sympathies, who realized that there were good people outside of the Jewish blood, and that every human heart had unsuspected resources of goodness in it which only needed the proper treatment to bring them to the surface and make them dominant in the life. Matthew had many friends among the lower classes, and he believed that they were all capable of salvation.

(4) He must have been a man of strong and independent

[20] Messages of the Books, p. 31.

nature, capable of standing alone if need be, ready to brave the worst that his own people might say or do against him when he had determined upon a course of action which he knew they would disapprove, a strong and silent man, persistent in the face of all remonstrance, faithful against all odds, firm as Gibraltar in all storms of wind or sea.

(5) He was a man of means. He may have chosen to be a publican because that office was more remunerative than any other in that city. He had a home of his own; and he was able to entertain a large number of people in his farewell feast. His house must have been large and his hospitality must have been famous, to gather together so many publicans and sinners on short notice upon that occasion.

(6) Matthew was withal a modest man. This is apparent in the following particulars. *a.* Luke tells us that Matthew "left all," [21] when he followed Jesus. This may mean that he sacrificed his property as well as his position when he became a disciple, and we notice that Matthew himself in the account of his call omits all mention of it. His modesty forbade his recording it. He says only, "He arose and followed him."[22]

b. It is Luke again who tells us that the feast which followed was in Matthew's own home. Matthew tells us what happened there, but modestly omits all mention of his own generosity and hospitality in connection with it. If Paul Veronese in his great painting of "The Banquet" in the Academy at Venice is at all justified in the magnificence of the surroundings and the munificence of the repast which he has pictured there, there must have been a great sacrifice of material comfort and wealth when Matthew left all to follow the Lord. He possibly sold all that he had and gave it to the poor. He may have used all his money in hand in the furnishing of this farewell feast. He did leave all his prospects of any advancement in his chosen field of work. Whatever of wealth or position he had, he left it all

[21] Luke 5. 28.

[22] Matt. 9. 9.

to follow Jesus; but he says nothing about it. The other evangelists give us these facts.

c. In the list of the apostles Matthew modestly puts the name of Thomas before his own.[23] In the other Synoptic lists this order is reversed and Matthew's name precedes that of Thomas.[24]

d. He is the only one to write himself down in the apostolic list as Matthew the publican. It was not a title of which to be proud. In the other lists of the apostles, Matthew's name is given and the disgraceful profession to which he had once belonged is not mentioned.[25] Matthew in all meekness and honesty affixes that opprobrious title to his name.[26] He makes no apology for it. He has no desire to rescue it from the odium resting upon it.

e. He does not record the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, in which the Lord seemed to suggest that a repentant publican was to be justified rather than his self-righteous critic in all the odor of ecclesiastical sanctity. It is just possible that this parable may represent a personal experience in the life of Matthew. That suggestion has been made, and if it be true it is all the more noteworthy that Matthew does not record it, while Luke does.

f. He does not tell the story of Zacchæus the publican with whom the Lord preferred to lodge rather than to go anywhere else in Jericho. We might have expected Matthew to notice those incidents in the Gospel history where publicans were singled out for preference or special favor. His modesty alone would prevent him from recording such things. However, his modesty would not prevent him from recording the Lord's great goodness in offering his companionship and his salvation to such as he. His modesty would not preclude his testimony to the great grace of God which

[23] Matt. 10. 3.
[24] Mark 3. 18; Luke 6. 15.
[25] Mark 3. 16-19; Luke 6. 14-16, and Acts 1. 13.
[26] Matt. 10. 3.

had reached even him and had transformed even him and had made of him a miracle of mercy and a guarantee of God's grace offered freely to all of his class. He says, "The Lord made me an apostle; and it was all of his matchless grace, for I was a publican!" and Matthew alone among the evangelists records that the Lord joined the publicans and harlots together in the statement that they believed John the Baptist and went into the Kingdom before the chief priests and the elders of the people.[27]

g. Possibly we may find another proof of Matthew's modesty and humility, in honor preferring another to himself, in the fact that he permitted Judas to become the treasurer of the apostolic company when he doubtless was much better qualified for that position than Judas or any one else.

This, then, is the character of the man who wrote the first Gospel. He was a renegade Jew, an associate with other bad characters, publicans and harlots, before his conversion, a man of means and disposed to be generous with them, a strong and independent nature, stern in his notions of retribution for all disobedience to law, and yet a lover of his fellow men, who after his conversion was a loyal Israelite and a faithful Christian, a modest, silent follower of the meek and lowly One whom he believed to be the Messiah of the Jews and the Saviour of the race. If Matthew ever addressed a single word to the Master, we have no record of it in our Scriptures; but Matthew has recorded more of the words of Jesus to the listening multitudes of Galilee than any other evangelist. His calling and his character had given him a special fitness for that work. We note this next.

6. *His Fitness for His Work*. (1) As a publican he would be used to writing and the keeping of accounts.

(2) He would be accustomed to the orderly arrangement of his thought and his material.

---

[27] Matt. 21. 31, 32.

(3) He would be interested in numbers and careful in the details of his work.

(4) He was acquainted with both the Greek and the Hebrew, as well as the Aramaic.

(5) His familiarity with pen and paper would enable him to take down the longer discourses more easily than others.

(6) He knew his Old Testament better than any other of the evangelists, if the number of original quotations from it is any criterion. He has eleven; Mark, two; Luke, three, and John, nine.

(7) He belonged to the circle of the intimate friends of Jesus, and may have been a relative.

(8) He does not seem to have been prominently engaged in other apostolic work, and may have been regarded from the very beginning as the fit secretary or amanuensis or record-keeper of the twelve.

What sort of a record would such a man make? What kind of a Gospel would he write? If we have read the man's character correctly we ought to find that the characteristics of the book correspond with the peculiar training and characteristics of the man. We turn from our study of the man to a study of his book to see if this be true.

III. The Book and Some of Its Characteristics

1. This is *The Gospel for the Jews.*

It is written by a Jew and its appeal is primarily to his own countrymen. This appears in many major and minor peculiarities.

(1) This Gospel alone begins with a genealogy, after the fashion of Hebrew histories. Luke has a genealogy, introduced later into his narrative. Matthew puts "the generation of Jesus Christ" first of all.

(2) In this genealogy Jesus is declared to be "the son of David, the son of Abraham," [28] and the descent of Jesus

[28] Matt. 1. 1.

begins with Abraham, the father of the Jewish race. That would satisfy the Jews for whom primarily Matthew wrote. Luke in his genealogy,[29] carries the line back to Adam, for he is not interested so much in emphasizing the Jewish descent of Jesus as his brotherhood with the entire race. Matthew gives us the genealogy of the Messiah of the *Jewish* race; Luke gives us the genealogy of the Brother of the *human* race.

(3) This Gospel gives more attention to the prophecies of the Old Testament than any other, and especially to some of the prophecies which would be of particular interest to the Jews; as, for example,

> "Out of thee [Bethlehem] shall come forth a governor,
> Who shall be shepherd of my people Israel." [30]

No other Gospel has these words. No one who was unacquainted with the Hebrew tongue could understand such a statement as that found in Matthew: He "dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that he should be called a Nazarene." [31] This becomes intelligible only in the light of the Hebrew of Isaiah 11. 1.

(4) This Gospel does not explain Jewish religious and civil customs nor give geographical and topographical details, as the other Gospels do. It presupposes that its readers are resident in Palestine and will know all of these things.

(5) In no other Gospel does the Lord give such unqualified indorsement to the Jewish law. Here only we read that he said, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill." [32] Here only we hear the statement and the command, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore

[29] Luke 3. 38.
[30] Micah 5. 2, quoted in Matt. 2. 6.
[31] Matt. 2. 23.
[32] Matt. 5. 17.

whatsoever they bid you, *these* do and observe."[33] In this Gospel alone do we find sin called *ἀνομία*, lawlessness.[34]

At the same time, a clear line of distinction is drawn between the divine law and the rabbinical additions and corrupt traditions of the scribes. Nowhere are the scribes and Pharisees so bitterly denounced for their innate disloyalty to the higher law and their insistence upon petty ceremonial observances as in the twenty-third chapter of this Gospel. The Gospel according to Matthew is a Gospel for the Jews, but it is a Gospel of the genuine Judaism as opposed to the travesty of the faith and the degenerate type of the religion represented by the Pharisees and the Sadducees and the scribes and the priests of that day. They thought they were fulfilling the law, but they were destroying it by making it an unendurable burden. Jesus came to fulfill the law by filling it full of freedom and mercy and grace. He destroyed it too, by replacing it with something higher and better, its legitimate consummation. They would have destroyed it not by filling it full but by draining it dry. That was the difference between Jesus and the Jewish officials of his day. Matthew makes this difference very clear.

(6) Matthew also makes it perfectly clear that the message of salvation came to the Jews first; and only after their rejection was it preached to the Samaritans and the Gentiles. He is careful to safeguard the prerogatives of the Jews at this point. In this Gospel only do we find Jesus commanding the twelve on their first mission, "Go not into *any* way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[35]

In this Gospel alone do we read that Jesus said to the Syrophœnician woman concerning his own mission, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[36]

---

[33] Matt. 23. 2, 3.
[34] Matt. 7. 23; 13. 41; 23. 28; 24. 12.
[35] Matt. 10. 5, 6.
[36] Matt. 15. 24.

(7) In this Gospel alone do we find the record of the quaking earth and the rending rocks and the opened tombs and the resurrected saints seen in Jerusalem at the time of the crucifixion.[37] These things were of most interest and importance to the Jews.

(8) In this Gospel alone do we find that peculiarly Jewish promise made to the twelve, "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." [38]

(9) This is the Gospel of the great commission. It begins with the statement that Jesus was the son of Abraham; and to Abraham God had promised that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. The Gospel closes with the suggestion that the time has come for the fulfillment of that promise through Jesus and the disciples of Jesus. The blessing has been won for the race, and Jesus says to the eleven, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations." [39]

(10) In this Gospel alone is Jerusalem called the holy city, and the city of the great King.[40]

(11) In this Gospel alone is the temple declared to be the dwelling place of God, and the holy place, and the temple of God. [41]

(12) Delitzsch traces in this Gospel written for the Jews a resemblance to the Pentateuch. Thus he arranges it in five parts. The first chapter of Matthew is "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ," and corresponds to Genesis. The second chapter begins with the slaughter of infants at Bethlehem, and the escape of Jesus, as Exodus began with the slaughter of infants in Egypt and the escape of Moses. The Sermon on the Mount in Galilee is, of course, the

---

[37] Matt. 27. 51-53.
[38] Matt. 19. 28.
[39] Matt. 28. 19.
[40] Matt. 4. 5; 5. 35.
[41] Matt. 23. 21; 24. 15; 21. 12; 26. 61.

counterpart to the law given from Mount Sinai. The eighth chapter opens with the cleansing of a leper. We have then reached what answers to the book of Leviticus. When we come to the tenth chapter we read of the organization provided for the church under the twelve apostles, corresponding to the narrative in Numbers of the ordering of the twelve tribes of Israel under their princes. At the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel, where the ministry in Judæa begins—a ministry of reproof, exhortation, and prophecy—we enter on the parallel to the book of Deuteronomy. The whole ends with the death and implied (not affirmed) ascension of Jesus, and with directions for the future guidance of the church, just as the Pentateuch ends with the death and implied ascension of Moses, and with directions for the future guidance of Israel.[42] It is an ingenious parallel, and, whatever element of fancy there may be about it, it yet remains clear that no such parallel could be made with the contents of any other of our Gospels.

We now have given twelve indications of the fact that the first Gospel was intended primarily for the Jews. Matthew was a Jew, and he had the cause of the Jew at heart, and he wrote a Gospel which in comparison with, and by contrast to, the others deserves to be called a Gospel for the Jews. Now, the Jews were the people of a Book, and their sacred Book was filled with prophecies in the realization of which they expected to enter upon their Golden Age. All their hopes centered in the Messiah. His coming would bring all other good things in its train. Matthew believed that Jesus was the expected Messiah and in writing out that good news for the Jews he must show them that in Jesus the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled. A Gospel for the Jews must be a Gospel of Fulfillment to serve its end. The first Gospel is emphatically worthy of that name.

2. This is *The Gospel of Fulfillment.*

It is as Godet has said: "The formula, 'that it might be

[42] Fraser, Synoptical Lectures, vol. ii, pp. 47, 48.

fulfilled,' is like a refrain repeated in every page of the book. In the two first chapters we find five detached incidents of the childhood of Jesus, connected with five prophetic sayings. At the opening of the ministry, in chapter four, is a prophecy of Isaiah which forms as it were its general text or motto, and announces that Galilee is to be the theater of the Messianic work. In chapter eight, as the central point of a collection of miraculous incidents, we have a saying of the same prophet, revealing the moral significance of all these wonders: 'Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses.' The series of teachings given in chapter twelve is also connected with a prophetic saying: 'Behold my servant whom I have chosen . . . he shall not strive nor cry . . . a bruised reed shall he not break.' And so on, up to the account of the Passion, of which every feature is in some way designated as the fulfillment of a prophecy." [43]

The phrases, *ἵνα* (or *ὅπως*) *πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν*, and *τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθέν* and others concerning the fulfillment of Scripture occur thirteen times in the Gospel according to Matthew.[44] They never are found in the Gospel according to Mark or the Gospel according to Luke. They occur six times in the Gospel according to John. Judging by the evidence of these phrases alone, we could conclude that of the four evangelists the two who were apostles were much more interested in the fulfillment of the Old Testament Messianic prophecies than the other two, and that Matthew laid twice as much stress as John upon this fulfillment. The first Gospel is almost a manual of Messianic prophecy. Matthew himself evidently is thoroughly familiar with the Old Testament, and we readily can believe that his own faith in the Messiahship of Jesus was greatly strengthened by the study of the Jewish Scriptures. He studied the life of Jesus and he studied the prophetic books, and again

[43] New Testament Studies, p. 11.

[44] 1. 22; 2. 15, 17, 23; 4. 14; 8. 17; 12. 17; 13. 14; 13. 35; 21. 4; 26. 54, 56; 27. 9.

and again he was struck with the strange correspondence between these two. When he wrote his book he used the prophecies to illustrate and illuminate the life.

Professor Bruce has pointed out the contrast between the first and the second Gospels at this point. He says: "Mark's dry statement, 'They went into Capernaum,' 1. 21, referring to Jesus and his followers proceeding northward from the scene of the baptism, in Matthew's hands assumes the character of the solemn announcement of an epoch-making event, whereby an ancient oracle concerning the appearing of a great light in Galilee of the Gentiles received its fulfillment, 4. 12-17. Again, Mark's matter-of-fact report of the extensive healing function in Capernaum on the Sabbath evening is in Matthew adorned with a beautiful citation from Isaiah's famous oracle concerning the suffering servant of Jehovah, 8. 17. Once more, to Mark's simple statement that Jesus withdrew himself to the sea after the collision with the Pharisees, occasioned by the healing on a Sabbath of the man with a withered hand, the first evangelist attaches a fine prophetic picture, as if to show readers the true Jesus as opposed to the Jesus of Pharisaic imagination, 12. 15-21. From these instances we see his method. He is not inventing history, but enriching history with prophetic emblazonments for apologetic purposes, or for increase of edification." [45]

Matthew's quotations from the Old Testament are not always direct Messianic prophecies. He has these, as in 2. 6; 7. 17; 12. 17; 26. 24. Sometimes, however, his quotations are merely literary appropriations of analogies in the Old Testament or fulfillments in type, as in 2. 15; 2. 17; 4. 14. In some cases the statements of the Old Testament are altered, to make them fit into the situation in the life of Jesus, as in 3. 3, where Matthew has, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness," instead of Isaiah's, "The voice of one that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of the

[45] Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. i, pp. 40, 41.

Lord," Isa. 40. 3; and as in 27. 9, where we have a very far-fetched analogy to Zech. 11. 12, 13.

Matthew was so convinced that the Old Testament was filled with foreshadowings of Jesus that he appropriated without hesitation not only direct references to the coming Messiah but anything and everything which could be brought into even remote connection with him. Therefore, not all of Matthew's quotations have evidential value. Some are merely literary embellishments, analogies of type, or remote analogies of appropriate and appropriated language; but all serve to show that to Matthew's mind the Old Testament was of chief interest as it bore witness to Jesus, and that it was clear to him that the Gospel of Jesus was a Gospel of Fulfillment throughout. He saw fulfillment of historical and ritual and legal types in Jesus, which the Jews had failed to see. This book was written partly to open their eyes at this point. In the New Testament it serves the same purpose among the Gospels that the Epistle to the Hebrews serves among the Epistles. Both endeavor to show that the Old Testament history and prophecy and legal requirements and ritual observances have found their fulfillment in Jesus.

It is but natural, therefore, that we should find more of the Old Testament in the Gospel according to Matthew than in any of the others. It has more quotations from the Old Testament in proportion to its length than any New Testament writing, except the Epistle to the Romans. Nine times we find direct quotations introduced by the phrase, "It is written," and six times the introductory phrase is "It has been said by them of old time." [46] Six times Jesus challenges his opponents with the ironical question, "Have you never read" this or that passage of the Old Testament which bears upon this question or throws its light upon this situation? In this way he refers these professed masters in Bible lore to Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, First Samuel, the book of

[46] 2. 5; 4. 4, 6, 7, 10; 11. 10; 21. 13; 26. 24, 31; 5. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43.

Psalms, and Isaiah.[47] Besides these which we have mentioned there are six other direct quotations from the Old Testament in Matthew, and between forty and fifty allusions to Old Testament phraseology. Altogether nineteen Old Testament books, the five books of the Law, three historical, two poetical, and nine prophetical books are used by Matthew in the composition of his Gospel. Fifteen Old Testament characters are mentioned by name, besides those whose names occur in the genealogy. The Gospel according to Matthew is a New Testament book, but it is built upon Old Testament foundations throughout.

When John the Baptist thought that Jesus ought not to come to him for baptism, Jesus answered, "Suffer *it* now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." [48] In the life of Jesus there was a fulfillment of all prophecy, and in the life of Jesus there was a fulfillment of all righteousness. The Gospel of Fulfillment is the Gospel of Righteousness as well.

3. This is *The Gospel of Righteousness.*

The words δίκαιος, "righteous," and δικαιοσύνη, "righteousness," are not absolutely peculiar to Matthew's use, but they occur more times in the first Gospel than in the other three combined, and so become characteristic of it.

(1) In Matthew alone we are told that Joseph the husband of Mary was a righteous man.[49] (2) In Matthew alone we read, "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness." [50] In Luke we read, "Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled." [51] (3) In Matthew alone we read, "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake." [52] Luke omits this characteristic phrase of

---

[47] 12. 3, 5; 19. 4; 21. 16, 42; 22. 31.
[48] Matt. 3. 15.
[49] Matt. 1. 19.
[50] Matt. 5. 6.
[51] Luke 6. 21.
[52] Matt. 5. 10.

Matthew and says instead, "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and . . . separate you . . . , and reproach you . . . for the Son of man's sake." [53]

(4) In Matthew alone we read, "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." [54] (5) In Matthew alone we read, The Father "sendeth rain on the just and the unjust [righteous and the unrighteous]." [55] (6) In Matthew alone we read, "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them." [56]

That was the indictment of Jesus against the Pharisees, that their righteousness was external and superficial, consisting too largely and too exclusively of external acts, and giving too little attention to the inner motives and the purity of the personal life. On the other hand, it was the indictment of the Pharisees against Jesus and his disciples that they neglected to purify their hands before meals,[57] and to observe the regular fasts,[58] and they deliberately broke the rules for the observance of the Sabbath,[59] and they habitually consorted with the unsavory and the undevout classes of society.[60] How could people do these things and still be righteous? That is the tragedy of this Gospel, as of so much of church history. It is the righteous arrayed against the righteous. In the name of righteousness the shining examples of righteousness among the people hunt the Righteous One to death.

(7) In Matthew alone we read, "Seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." [61] Luke records the command, but omits Matthew's characteristic word, "Seek ye his kingdom, and

---

[53] Luke 6. 22.
[54] Matt. 5. 20.
[55] Matt. 5. 45.
[56] Matt. 6. 1.
[57] Matt. 15. 2.
[58] Matt. 9. 14.
[59] Matt. 12. 2.
[60] Matt. 9. 11.
[61] Matt. 6. 33.

these things shall be added unto you." [62] (8) In Matthew alone we read, "He that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward." [63] (9) In Matthew alone we read, "Many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not." [64]

(10) Matthew alone has the promise, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." [65] (11) Matthew alone has the Master's statement, "The angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous." [66] (12) Matthew alone records that saying of Jesus to the chief priests and elders, "John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not." [67]

(13) Matthew alone has that scathing rebuke of Jesus to the scribes and the Pharisees, and he rings the changes on the word "righteous" through all the closing sentences. "Ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men," [68] "Ye . . . garnish the tombs of the righteous," [69] "Upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zacharias." [70] Luke has this closing statement with the two occurrences of the word "righteous" left out.[71] (14) In Matthew alone we have that final parable of judgment, and in it we read, "Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee?" [72] and then at last, "The righteous [shall go] into eternal life,"[73] (15) In Matthew alone we read that Judas said, "I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent [righteous] blood." [74]

---

[62] Luke 12. 31.
[63] Matt. 10. 41.
[64] Matt. 13. 17.
[65] Matt. 13. 43.
[66] Matt. 13. 49.
[67] Matt. 21. 32.
[68] Matt. 23. 28.
[69] Matt. 23. 29.
[70] Matt. 23. 35.
[71] Luke 11. 51.
[72] Matt. 25. 37.
[73] Matt. 25. 46.
[74] Matt. 27. 4.

(16) Matthew alone records that Pilate's wife sent word to him, "Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man," [75] and that Pilate washed his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man." [76]

From the beginning to the end of this Gospel Jesus is the Righteous One, the One fulfilling all righteousness, and his disciples are called unto righteousness. The whole book, therefore, becomes an exposition of the nature and claims of righteousness, as set forth in the life and the teaching of Jesus and his followers. It is characteristic of Matthew's presentation that he makes the gospel of Jesus a Gospel of Righteousness throughout. Jesus said, "Seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness." [77] The righteousness he demanded was the righteousness of the Kingdom. The Gospel of Righteousness was the Gospel of the Kingdom as well.

4. This Gospel is *The Gospel of the Kingdom.*

Matthew calls it "the kingdom of the heavens." The other evangelists have the phrase, "the kingdom of God," [78] but "the kingdom of the heavens" is found in Matthew alone. It occurs in the first Gospel thirty-three times, and nowhere else in the New Testament. Both by its uniqueness and its frequency of use it becomes characteristic of this Gospel throughout. The plural, *οὐρανοί*, heavens, is a Hebraism: and we are not surprised to find it in a Gospel written by a Hebrew for the Hebrews. John never has this plural. Luke has it only four times, and never combined with "the kingdom." Matthew has it even when speaking of the dwelling place of God.[79]

(1) In this Gospel alone the message of John the Baptist is given, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at

---

[75] Matt. 27. 19.
[76] Matt. 27. 24.
[77] Matt. 6. 33.
[78] Found also in Matt. 12. 28; 19. 24; 21. 31, 43.
[79] Matt. 6. 1, 9.

hand." [80] In the preaching of John as recorded in Mark and Luke there is nothing about a kingdom. They say that John preached "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." [81]

(2) According to Matthew the text of the first sermons of Jesus was, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," [82] and he began his first sermon recorded here, "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." [83] (3) The further record is that he went everywhere preaching "the gospel of the kingdom." [84] Jesus has no other name for it. Only once in this book does he speak of "the gospel," without calling it the gospel of the kingdom.[85] It is true, therefore, in a sense that Jesus did not preach the gospel of salvation; "He came that there might be a gospel of salvation to preach. He *is* the gospel of salvation; he *preached* the gospel of the Kingdom." [86] In this Gospel only is the preaching of Jesus called "the word of the kingdom," [87] What the other books of the New Testament repeatedly call "the gospel," Matthew with but one exception calls "the gospel of the kingdom." [88]

(4) The characteristic difference between the presentation of this gospel in Matthew and in the other evangelists can be seen in a comparison of Matt. 18. 1-4 with Luke 9. 46-48. In Matthew we read that the disciples asked, "Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Jesus set a child in the midst of them and said, "Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the king-

[80] Matt. 3. 2.
[81] Mark 1. 4. Luke 3. 3.
[82] Matt. 4. 17.
[83] Matt. 5. 3.
[84] Matt. 4. 23; 5. 3, 10, 19, 20.
[85] Matt. 26. 13.
[86] The Teachings of the Books, p. 29.
[87] Matt. 13. 19.
[88] Matt. 9. 35; 24. 14. The exception, already noted, is in Matt. 26. 13.

dom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Three times in the four verses the phrase, "the kingdom of heaven" appears. When we turn to Luke we find the same story with Matthew's thrice repeated phrase omitted.

(5) What is true of all of the preaching of Jesus as presented in Matthew is particularly true of his parables. The first Gospel has fifteen of our Lord's parables, and twelve of them begin with the words, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto—." See how the phrase recurs in the parable chapter, the thirteenth. "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that sowed good seed in his field." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in the field." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind." "Every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder." Eight times in the single chapter the changes are rung on this phrase, "the kingdom of heaven," [89] and in the parallels in the other Gospels the phrase is not found.

Again we read, "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a certain king, who made a marriage feast for his son." [90] In Luke we find the same parable, but nothing is said about a kingdom or a king. Luke has it, "A certain man made a great supper." Luke always is emphasizing the real humanity of Jesus and the broad, human aspects of his gospel. In accordance with this point of view, it is "a man" rather than "a king" who figures in his parables; "a certain man

[89] Matt. 13. 11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52.
[90] Matt. 22. 2.

made a great supper," "a certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho," "a certain man had two sons." [91] In Matthew, on the contrary, we have the kingdom and the king. "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come . . . , and to those on the left hand, Depart." [92] This is the Gospel of the Kingdom because it is the Gospel of the King.

5. This is *The Gospel of Jesus the King.*

Matthew had been an official. He had due respect for the authority of the sovereign. He writes of Jesus as the great King.

(1) The genealogy with which he begins is that of the royal line, of the kings and the heirs of kings. Jesus is shown to be the son of David, the legitimate heir of the kingdom. The first division of that genealogy shows that David was the heir to the promises made to Abraham. The second division gives the line of the actual kings from David to the exile into Babylon. The third division shows that Jesus was in the line of the lawful heirs to the throne if the kingdom had survived and the rights of the royal family had been observed. Jesus was born in the royal succession. He had the blood of kings in his veins. *Noblesse oblige.* The obligation was upon him to bear himself kinglike from the beginning to the end.

(2) The first title given to Jesus by man in this Gospel is found in the question of the Wise Men, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" [93] These Wise Men had come from far to find a King. When they found the babe they fell down before him and acknowledged his kingship with royal gifts of gold and frankincense and myrrh. This story is found in this Gospel alone.

(3) It is in this Gospel alone that we read of Herod's

[91] Luke 14. 16; 10. 25; 15. 11.
[92] Matt. 25. 1, 34, 41.
[93] Matt. 2. 2.

great alarm over the news of the birth of a rival king, for the scribes and the elders read him the prophecy that out of Bethlehem there should come a Governor who should rule over the people Israel. Herod himself was king. He would brook no rival. He slaughtered all the Bethlehem babes rather than run any risk in that matter. Matthew alone has told us how uneasy lay the head that wore the crown when this real Head of God's Israel was born.

(4) When we think of Mary and Jesus we speak of the Mother and Child. Matthew never does. It is always "the child and his mother" with him.[94] The prince takes first rank in the family from the moment of his birth, in Matthew's narrative.

(5) In Matthew when Jesus is accused of sabbath-breaking he defends himself by an appeal to the experience and the example of David, the king.[95] The inference is plain. "David did this; why should not I? I am the son of David, the king." In John we find the same charge brought against Jesus, but here he answers not as the son of David by an appeal to the example of David, but as the Son of God by an appeal to the example of the Father.[96]

(6) In Matthew we read that Jesus cured a blind and dumb man, and the multitudes were amazed and said, "Can this be the son of David?" [97] In Luke we read a parallel account, and Luke tells us that the multitudes marveled, but he omits their question, "Is not this the son of David?", which Matthew is careful to put into his record.[98] Eight times in this Gospel Jesus is called the son of David.[99]

(7) In Matthew Jesus conducts himself kinglike from the beginning to the end of his ministry, with a royalty all his

---

[94] Matt. 2. 11, 13, 14, 20, 21.
[95] Matt. 12. 3.
[96] John 5. 17.
[97] Matt. 12. 23.
[98] Luke 11 : 14.
[99] Matt. 1. 1; 9. 27; 12. 23; 15. 22; 20. 30; 20. 31; 21. 9; 21. 15.

own. Son of David, *the* King, he was himself every inch a king—King over the angry sea,[100] King over the demoniac host,[101] King in the midst of mobs,[102] King in the judgment hall,[103] King on the cross, "THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS." [104] Pilate asked the mocking question, "Art thou the King of the Jews?",[105] and the echo of that question voiced the truth. The soldiers' banter of royal robe and reed and crown, all unwittingly set forth the fact.[106] The chief priests and scribes and elders quoted with exquisite sarcasm, "He is the King of Israel," [107] and were wholly unconscious that all they, his enemies, were thus made to confess the kingship before which every knee should bow. Jesus was a king: and Matthew shows him kingly throughout.

(8) Three times Matthew records a formal presentation of Jesus as king to the people: at his birth, when the Wise Men roused the capital city with their inquiry," Where is this first-born King of the Jews?"; at the beginning of his active ministry, when John the Baptist, as forerunner, heralded the advent of a kingdom and a King; and at the close of that ministry, when Jesus rode into the royal city with something of the assumption of royal state, and the people cried, "Hosanna to the Son of David," and that word of prophecy was fulfilled which said,

> "Tell ye the daughter of Zion,
> Behold, thy King cometh unto thee." [108]

(9) Matthew alone says that Jesus spoke with author-

[100] Matt. 8. 27.
[101] Matt. 8. 29.
[102] Matt. 21. 12, 13; 26. 52-55.
[103] Matt. 26. 64.
[104] Matt. 27. 37.
[105] Matt. 27. 11.
[106] Matt. 27. 28, 29.
[107] Matt. 27. 42.
[108] Matt. 2. 2; 3. 2; 21. 5, 9.

ity, and this statement is made at the close of the discourse in which he had laid down "the manifesto of a King," what Tholuck has called "the Magna Charta of the new kingdom." [109]

The tone of authority had been ringing all through that Sermon on the Mount. Jesus had presumed to set aside the law of Moses more than once. "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time:—but I say unto you" something else, something better, something of higher authority than that of the old law thus set aside. It was the habit of the rabbis and theological professors then as now seldom or never to present any dictum or lay down any law without backing it up with a respectable list of authorities, great names which could be quoted in its behalf. Jesus never quoted authorities among the rabbis or the great masters of Israel. He spoke with the authority of the truth which needed no recommendation by men. He spake as never man spake before him. He spake with authority, and not as the scribes. Fifty-four times in this Gospel that "I say unto you" of Jesus occurs.

In this Gospel only does Jesus claim authority to purify his kingdom,[110] and it is in the twenty-third chapter of this Gospel that we find the fullest presentation of the exercise of that authority by Jesus, that chapter in which he pronounces the woes upon the hypocrisy and the sin of the recognized religious authorities among the people. In this Gospel only do we find that closing statement made by Jesus, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." [111] In Matthew alone does Jesus give to Peter the keys of the kingdom.[112] In Matthew alone, but in this Gospel twice, Jesus speaks of sitting on the throne of his glory. "In the regeneration when the Son of man shall

[109] Matt. 7. 29.
[110] Matt. 13. 41.
[111] Matt. 28. 18.
[112] Matt. 16. 19.

sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones," [113] and "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations. . . . Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." [114] In Matthew alone Jesus states that twelve legions of angels were at his command.[115]

(10) In the account of the crucifixion Matthew alone tells us of the darkness, of the rent rocks, and the opened graves; showing how heaven and earth and hades acknowledged their King.[116]

(11) Matthew describes the death of Jesus by a peculiar expression, "*ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα*," "He dismissed his spirit." [117] There is something regal, imperial, about the very phrase. According to Matthew, the last act of his life was a kingly act. Mark and Luke use the same word, "*ἐξέπνευσεν*," "He breathed out his life, he expired." [118] John says, "He delivered up his spirit," "*παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα*." [119] Matthew alone makes even the death of Jesus the act of a sovereign, the deed of a king.

A King who showed himself to be a worthy King in word and deed, and yet a King rejected by the very people over whom he had come to rule; that is the picture of the life of Jesus presented in the first Gospel. All the Gospel histories are tragic enough, but the Gospel according to Matthew is darkened with tragedy throughout. The Gospel of the Rejected King becomes a Gospel of Gloom.

---

[113] Matt. 19. 28.
[114] Matt. 25. 31, 34.
[115] Matt. 26. 53.
[116] Matt. 27. 45, 51-53.
[117] Matt. 27. 50.
[118] Mark 15. 37; Luke 23. 46.
[119] John 19. 30.

6. This is *The Gospel of Gloom.*

(1) Luke's narrative begins with songs; Matthew's narrative begins with sobs. Mary weeps, for her husband is about to put her away. Jerusalem is troubled. Herod is in a rage. The mothers of Bethlehem, like Rachel, are not to be comforted. The voice of their mourning was heard through the land. In Luke the boy is welcomed by the angels and the shepherds, by Simeon and Anna; and Mary and Elisabeth sing for joy. The second chapter of Luke closes, "Jesus advanced in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and men." The second chapter of Matthew closes with "He should be called a Nazarene," and all through this Gospel Jesus is despised and rejected of men.

(2) In this Gospel Jesus continually is fleeing from his enemies, "withdrawing" into some safer place. That word "withdraw," *ἀναχωρέω*, becomes characteristic of Matthew's use. Mark has the word once,[120] and John once,[121] and Luke not at all; but in Matthew we find it ten times.[122]

(3) There is no word of human sympathy for the Crucified One recorded in this Gospel, no penitent thief with faith triumphing in death, no company of women loudly wailing their grief. These things are found in Luke; but there is nothing of the sort in Matthew. In this narrative all who pass by revile the Crucified One.[123]

(4) The gloom deepens toward the close of the narrative. There is only one cry upon the cross in this Gospel, that awful cry, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani, . . . My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[124] There are seven words on the cross recorded in the various Gospels. Is it not a remarkable fact that of the seven only one is recorded

---

[120] Mark 3. 7.
[121] John 6. 15.
[122] Matt. 2. 12, 13, 14, 22; 4. 12; 9. 24; 12. 15; 14. 13; 15. 21; 27. 5.
[123] Matt. 27. 39.
[124] Matt. 27. 46.

in the Gospel according to Matthew and the Gospel according to Mark, and that that one should be this cry of agony and despair? Matthew has been writing the life history of the Messias of Israel, and the last words he records as spoken by this Messias are these words of disappointment, this confession of the consciousness that he was forsaken of God! A Messias forsaken of God! It is not his enemies who say it of him. He confesses it of himself. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and then his lips are closed until the curtain falls upon the Crucified One. Could anything be gloomier than that? If we had had no other Gospel than this first Gospel, we might have believed through all the centuries that our Christ died with this one cry of inexplicable perplexity upon his lips, with this sense of utter desolation upon his soul, with his spirit overwhelmed in the depths of nethermost darkness, with this feeling of absolute depression and disappointment and despair. If we had had no other Gospel than this Gospel of Gloom, we might have supposed forever that the last uttered words of our Lord were this cry from the utter midnight of the soul.

(5) Matthew is a pessimist at times. He alone records the statement that there are few who find the narrow gate and straitened way which lead into life.[125] He alone preserves the Lord's saying which summarizes the truth of the marriage feast parable, "Many are called, but few chosen," [126] and he alone has those parables of judgment, the tares, the dragnet, the ten virgins, and the sheep and goats. He alone preserves the prophecy that at the end of the age the love of the majority shall wax cold.[127] He alone emphasizes the outer darkness into which the outcasts from the Kingdom fall.[128]

It is a great tragedy which Matthew records, and the

[125] Matt. 7. 14.
[126] Matt. 22. 14.
[127] Matt. 24. 12.
[128] Matt. 20. 12, 13.

tragic tone pervades his narrative. Again and again we come upon words which make the blood run cold.

(6) That fearful twenty-third chapter is peculiar to this Gospel. Here only do we read that Jesus called the religious authorities "serpents and offspring of vipers." [129] The chapter climaxes with the statement, "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate," [130] and that statement is followed by the other statement of the fact which fulfilled it, "Jesus went out from the temple, and was going on his way," [131] never to return to the temple precincts again during the incarnation. That first statement of the twenty-fourth chapter never should have been separated from the closing statement of the twenty-third chapter. The recorded action is the fulfillment of the recorded prophecy.

(7) Before that storm had burst, there had been mutterings of thunder and lightning flashes of wrath which Matthew alone records. Here only we find that the man delivered from the unclean spirit for a time but repossessed by the same spirit and seven others more evil than himself, the last state of whom was far worse than the first, is a fit symbol of the fate of that evil generation to which Jesus spake.[132] Here only we read that Jesus said that the teachings of the Pharisees were many of them ungodly and should be as plants rooted up.[133] Here only Jesus tells the rulers of the Jews, "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." [134]

(8) The final miracle of Matthew's account, the blasting of the fig tree,[135] was only the concrete representation of the

---

[129] Matt. 23. 33.
[130] Matt. 23. 38.
[131] Matt. 24. 1.
[132] Matt. 12. 43-45.
[133] Matt. 15. 13.
[134] Matt. 21. 43.
[135] Matt. 21. 19.

blasting given and promised to the faithless and fruitless people.

(9) Matthew alone records that Jesus quoted the words of Isaiah's prophecy and applied them to his hearers, saying,

> "This people's heart is waxed gross,
> And their ears are dull of hearing,
> And their eyes they have closed;
> Lest haply they should perceive with their eyes,
> And hear with their ears,
> And understand with their heart,
> And should turn again,
> And I should heal them." [136]

(10) In Matthew alone do we find the climax of the gloomy picture of the national rejection of the King in their voluntary assumption of the consequences of their deed, "And all the people answered and said, His blood *be* on us, and on our children." [137] Guilty men never uttered more terrible words than those.

The reason for this prevailing gloom in the first Gospel is that it is the Gospel of the Messias, who was the Messias of the nation, and who was rejected by the nation. This rejection was the greatest possible national calamity. The record of it could be only a record of gloom. There may have been individuals who welcomed the truth, but Matthew is not interested so much in them. He had been an official in the Roman empire. He had kept official records in his publican's booth. He makes of this Gospel an official record of the relations existing between the nation's Messias and the nation itself. The record becomes a gloomy record because it is devoted to this official aspect of the Messianic career.

7. This is *The Official Gospel.*

(1) The other Gospels are full of the accounts of per-

[136] Matt. 13. 15.
[137] Matt. 27. 25.

sonal friendships and record many intimate personal and private relations. They tell us of that disciple whom Jesus loved, of the family at Bethany and their hospitable home and their devoted hearts, of the company of women who journeyed with Jesus and ministered to him and his disciples, and of many private conversations with close friends and sympathetic souls. Matthew omits all of these things.

(2) On the other hand, the official relation of John the Baptist to the Messianic movement is emphasized at every turn in the ministry of Jesus.[138]

(3) The denunciations of this Gospel are the denunciations of officials, the religious authorities, the false prophets, the blind guides, the men who deceive and mislead the people; and Jesus calls them dogs-in-the-manger and ravening wolves.[139]

(4) The parables of this Gospel picture the official relations of the kingdom and the King. (5) The precepts of this Gospel have to do with the official relations of Messianic subjects to the Messianic Sovereign.

(6) The final discourse of Jesus climaxes in the Judgment scene, in which all nations are gathered before the King, and he separates them one from another by official decree.[140] (7) The Gospel closes with the official commission, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations."[141]

The Jewish nation had rejected Jesus. Other nations would receive him. All nations at last are to be his disciples. The Gospel of Gloom as far as it records the rejection of the Jews becomes a Gospel of Hope as far as the Gentiles are concerned.

8. This is *The Gospel of Hope for the Gentiles.*

(1) The genealogy in the first chapter suggests it. Four

---

[138] Matt. 4. 14; 11. 2; 14. 12; 17. 11-13.
[139] Matt. 7. 15; 23. 13-36; 24. 11.
[140] Matt. 25. 32-46.
[141] Matt. 28. 19.

women are mentioned in that genealogical list, namely, Tamar, Ruth, Rahab, and Bathsheba. It was not customary to introduce the names of any women into such a list. We wonder why Matthew does it, and we wonder the more when we see that these four names are the names of a prostitute, a harlot, a woman of an alien and reprobate race, and an adulteress. Why does Matthew put any women into his genealogy? Why does he put these women in? He might have found the names of good and noble women, like Sarah and Rachel and Rebecca in the Jewish history. Why does he choose these four for mention out of the whole possible list?

It has been suggested in answer to these questions that the Jews had been whispering slanders against the Virgin Mary, and that Matthew in militant mood reminds them by the introduction of these names into his genealogy that people in glass houses should not throw stones. Their own Royal House had several blots upon its 'scutcheon, and such charges as they had been making came with very poor grace from them. The first heir to David's throne was the offspring of an unlawful marriage. Matthew does not name Solomon's mother, Bathsheba: but calls her "the wife of Uriah."

This may be true; but we prefer to believe that Matthew puts these women into the list because each of them, like Matthew himself, was an outcast, either with a clouded reputation or under the social ban, and yet each of them had been admitted to superlative privilege in the Kingdom. If these were acknowledged members of the Messianic family, there surely would be hope for any one to gain admission there. At any rate, two of these women were Gentiles, foreigners from hated and hostile tribes; and if two Gentiles had been among the ancestresses of the Lord, all Gentiles might feel that they had a share in the redemption he brought.

Rahab was a Gentile, and worse. She was a heathen and a harlot as well. Ruth had a better and an unblemished

personal reputation, but she was a Moabitess, and what did the ancient law say about the Moabites? "An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of Jehovah forever. . . . Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days forever." [142] Yet these two women, one very guilty and one very good, but both of them heathen and under the ban of the sacred law, had come into the line of the ancestry of Jesus. He had heathen blood in his veins, and worse than heathen blood. Before these two women had come into the line a prostitute had become the mother of one of the forefathers of Jesus, and after these two women had come into the line an adulteress had given birth to another of his fathers according to the flesh.

We are glad that Matthew has chosen to record the names of these women in the genealogy. There they stand to prove that Jesus was not free from "taints of blood" in his human ancestry, and that whatever perfection of human character he attained was reached not by the aid of perfect purity of heredity, but in despite of a heavy handicap of sensuality and sin handed down to him through human weakness and moral failure and all the black catalogue of crime. He had no advantage of us in his humanity. It may be that some of us have advantage of him. Anyway, no matter what any man's heredity may be, he need not lose hope of his salvation and of his possible purity and perfection of Christian character as long as this first page stands here in the first Gospel. Sin, sorrow, shame are all chronicled here in the beginning of Matthew's record; and yet the genealogy ends with Jesus. It might symbolize the history of the race: sin, sorrow, shame all along the line, but salvation in the end.

(2) Matthew alone tells the story of the Eastern Magi. The first to herald the coming of the King and to acknowledge his claims to homage and royal gifts were these for-

[142] Deut. 23. 3, 6.

eigners from a far land. Gentiles were the first to proclaim him who was come to be King of the Jews.[143]

(3) Matthew alone records how John the Baptist inveighs against all Jewish feeling of security in racial prerogatives and how he assures his hearers that God can raise up children unto Abraham from the very stones of the desert.[144] Abraham's race henceforth would not be the Jewish race alone, but it would be recruited from the waste places and from the waste products of the earth. Gentiles would be raised up of God to represent the true faith of Father Abraham.

(4) Matthew continually shows that where the Jews had failed to recognize the Messiah and honor the King, the Gentiles had done better than they. In the very beginning the babe was driven out of Palestine by the Jews, but found a refuge among the Egyptians.[145] He sojourned in the land of bondage for a time, even as his race had done in the days between Joseph and Moses. He came out from the land of darkness and of bondage into the Promised Land, even as so many of the sons of God have done in their spiritual experience. In the days of his active ministry when the Jews were unbelievers Jesus said to a Canaanitish woman, a Gentile, "Great is thy faith!",[146] and upon another occasion he said to another Gentile, a Roman centurion, "I have not found so great faith . . . in Israel."[147] When the Jews clamored for the death of Jesus, it was Pilate's wife, a Gentile, who sent word, "Have nothing to do with that righteous man."[148] The Jews reviled the Crucified One, but the Roman guards said, "Truly this was the Son of God."[149]

(5) Matthew is not so blinded by his Jewish prejudices that he is unwilling to recognize the facts, and he is the more ready to give the Gentiles their due credit because of his

[143] Matt. 2. 1-12.
[144] Matt. 3. 9.
[145] Matt. 2. 14, 15.
[146] Matt. 15. 28.
[147] Matt. 8. 10.
[148] Matt. 27. 19.
[149] Matt. 27. 54.

memory of some things which the Master had said. He records those sayings of Jesus which point to an impartial and unprejudiced preference of the Gentiles with the disciple's fidelity to the spirit and teaching of the Lord.

He tells us how Jesus declared that the centurion's faith was only an earnest of the faith which multitudes of the Gentiles would exercise in the coming days: "I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness." [150] The Gentiles will flock in; the Jews will be cast out.

Matthew has recorded that Jesus declared that Tyre and Sidon would have repented if they had had the opportunities of Chorazin and Bethsaida;[151] and that it would be more tolerable for those Gentile cities than for the Jewish cities in the Day of Judgment. Unrepentant Sodom would find more tolerable judgment than unrepentant Capernaum.[152]

Matthew has recorded the parable of the vineyard, closing with the words, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." [153] The Jews had rejected the King's Son, and the kingdom would be taken away from them.

In the parable of the king's marriage feast for his son, there is the suggestion of the same grim truth; for, when those first bidden had refused to come, the king sent his servants "unto the partings of the highways" to find guests.[154] The first missionaries followed Paul along the highways of the nations with their invitation to all the Gentile peoples to come and partake of the gospel feast.

Their warrant for so doing was found in the great com-

---

[150] Matt. 8. 11, 12.
[151] Matt. 11. 21.
[152] Matt. 11. 23, 24.
[153] Matt. 21. 43.
[154] Matt. 22. 9.

mission which Matthew alone records. "Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations." [155] Their mission was not to be limited to the Jewish race: it was to include all the nations of the earth. They were not to circumcise their converts and make them Jews, but they were to baptize them and make them Christians. They were not to labor to glorify or to increase the numbers of any particular people or race. They were to include all peoples in their propaganda and to unite them all in one Christian Church.

This Gospel is written primarily for the Jews: but it is the Gospel of Hope for all the Gentiles; and these two seemingly contradictory but really consistent elements give the Gospel its impartial and catholic character, lift it "outside the contests of the apostolic time," [156] and make it the Gospel of Christ's Church.

9. This is *The Gospel of the Church.*

(1) The word ἐκκλησία, "church," occurs sixty-eight times in the epistles, twenty-three times in the book of Acts, twenty times in the book of Revelation, and only three times in the Gospels; and each of these three occurrences is in the Gospel according to Matthew. As the only Gospel which mentions the church by name, it may be distinguished from the others by that fact.

(2) Matthew alone has preserved the promise that the church founded upon Peter and Peter's faith would prevail against all its future foes.[157]

(3) He alone has recorded the Master's suggestions concerning church discipline.[158] He alone has the command to institute the ordinance of baptism as an initiatory rite in church membership.[159]

10. This is *The Gospel of the Publican.*

---

[155] Matt. 28. 18, 19.
[156] Jülicher, Einleitung, p. 194.
[157] Matt. 16. 18.
[158] Matt. 18. 17.
[159] Matt. 28. 19.

We would expect to find some trace of Matthew's profession in his writing. It has been suggested that his accuracy and his effective arrangement of his materials bear evidence to his acquaintance with business ledgers and bookkeeping. However, we look for some more particular indications of the taxgatherer's interest and observation.

(1) We notice that Matthew is the only one of the gospel writers who has recorded that saying of Jesus to the Pharisees, "John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him." [160] Did Matthew the publican cherish such a saying in memory when others had forgotten it? He would rejoice in the Master's recognition of the publicans' ready acceptance of the good news of the gospel. He would be glad to record the fact that a believing publican was better than an unbelieving Pharisee in the eyes of Jesus. He alone has preserved this saying of the Lord.

The Pharisees hated the publicans, and Matthew the publican seems to take delight in recording denunciations of the Pharisees. Luke tells us that John the Baptist met the multitudes who flocked into the wilderness to hear him with the discouraging greeting, "Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" [161] Matthew takes pains to make it clear that it was not the general multitude of the people whom John so addressed, but only the Pharisees and Sadducees whom he saw among them.[162] Over against that denunciation by the Forerunner at the beginning of the Gospel Matthew alone has recorded that great denunciation of the scribes and the Pharisees by the Master toward the ministry's close, culminating with the same epithet used by John, "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?[163] Who were

[160] Matt. 21. 32.
[161] Luke 3. 7.
[162] Matt. 3. 7.
[163] Matt. 23. 33.

these Pharisees? They were the ones who asked Pilate to set a watch over the tomb of Jesus, Matthew says.[164] They were the ones who called Jesus a deceiver, Matthew says.[165] They were the ones whom the Master called hypocrites and denounced in unmeasured terms, Matthew says.[166] We are dependent upon him for these items of information. As a publican he was perfectly willing to preserve them in his Gospel.

It has been suggested that the first two chapters are a refutation of Pharisaic calumnies. Jesus was born of a virgin, he came out of Egypt, he was from Nazareth; but none of these things were to his discredit. They were supernaturally ordered. Jesus was divinely guided through all his life. The calumnies founded upon these facts fade away in the light of the whole of the truth. The Pharisees might call Abraham their father,[167] and they might call themselves the sons of the Kingdom; but they would be cast forth into the outer darkness to weep and gnash their teeth, nevertheless.[168] Had they not said that Jesus cast out demons by the prince of demons?[169] Had they not claimed that Jesus was the personal representative and partner of Beelzebub?[170] They would have a chance to find out by personal acquaintance who Beelzebub was and what sort of people represented him, when they were at home with him in hell. Had not Jesus called these sons of the kingdom the sons of hell?[171] Had not Jesus told his disciples to beware of their teaching?[172] Matthew the publican had winced under the scorn of these Pharisees many a time; and he had seen them wince

[164] Matt. 27. 62.
[165] Matt. 27. 63.
[166] Matt. 23. 13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33.
[167] Matt. 3. 9.
[168] Matt. 8. 12.
[169] Matt. 9. 34.
[170] Matt. 12. 24.
[171] Matt. 23. 15.
[172] Matt. 16. 12.

many a time under the Master's scorn. As a converted publican he took grim delight in recording some of the Master's words concerning them.

(2) Matthew is the only one of the gospel writers who has told us about that payment of the temple tax at Capernaum. The tax collectors asked Peter if his teacher would pay the tax; and Jesus said to Simon, "What thinkest thou, Simon? the kings of the earth, from whom do they receive toll or tribute?" [173] We can imagine how Matthew was all alert to hear the answer to that question. Here was a matter which concerned him. He had been a tax-collector a large part of his life. The incident awoke within him all the memories and the associations of his former career. He remembered Peter's reply and the Master's interpretation of it, and how the tax was paid with the proceeds of the fish Peter caught. He, the publican, is the only evangelist to record these things.

(3) We remember again that when the Herodians asked Jesus, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar?" both Mark and Luke in recording the incident say that Jesus said, "Bring me a penny," but Matthew alone tells us that Jesus commanded, "Show me the tribute money. [174] He used the official term, *τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου*, the established and legal requirement of tribute. He had become accustomed to that stilted term in the red-tape phraseology of the tax-collector's booth; and he alone is careful to say that the exact coin which represented the legal tribute money about which they questioned lay in the hand of Jesus when he made the reply which sent them away marveling and silenced for the time.

(4) We remember again that Matthew has a double account of the Master's declarations concerning the taking of oaths,[175] and that we find no parallels to these paragraphs in the other Gospels. In the neighborhood of the taxgath-

[173] Matt. 17. 25.
[174] Matt. 22. 19.
[175] Matt. 5. 34-37; 23. 16-22.

erer's booth there had been much quibbling about the greater or less validity of certain oaths. Matthew had heard much swearing and forswearing. He may have asked the Master for some definite and authoritative statement on this subject. When that statement was given he deemed it of sufficient importance to be recorded. He put down two distinct utterances of Jesus in this matter. No other evangelist records them. Matthew the publican has preserved them to all time.

(5) In the sending out of the twelve apostles Mark says that Jesus told them to take no brass or copper money, *χαλκόν*, in their purse.[176] In the account given by Luke the Master commands the apostles to take no silver, *ἀργύριον*, for their journey.[177] When we turn to Matthew to find this command we notice that he exhausts all the possibilities in the coinage of the country at this point and says that the apostles were to possess neither gold nor silver nor brass, *χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκόν*.[178] Is this difference to be accounted for by the fact that the publican was more interested in money matters than either Mark or Luke, and that he therefore noticed very carefully that Jesus had ruled out all the larger as well as the lesser coins of the realm when he sent out the twelve to represent him among the peasants of Palestine? This seems to us more probable than that any of these words should have been later editorial additions to Matthew's originally single term.

(6) We believe this the more readily since it is apparent throughout the first Gospel that Matthew is interested in large sums of money as well as in smaller amounts. He alone has the parable of the talents. In the Gospel according to Mark only three coins are mentioned, the mite and the farthing and the penny. These were the smallest coins in circulation in Palestine. In the Gospel according to Luke we find the parable of the pounds, dealing with larger sums

[176] Mark 6. 8.
[177] Luke 9. 3.
[178] Matt. 10. 9.

of money. Matthew introduces us to the talent, which was worth seventy times as much as the pound and at least eight thousand times as much as the penny. Matthew had been handling money both in smaller and more considerable sums as a publican; and we are not surprised, therefore, to find that he mentions more coins and rarer coins and larger sums of money than the other evangelists do, and that he is more interested in money matters and more careful in naming money sums than they seem to be.

At these points, then, we suspect the special interest of the tax-collector to have been manifested in the record. They may be deemed sufficient to warrant us in naming this Gospel the Gospel of the Publican.

11. This is *The Gospel of Systematic Arrangement.*

We have suggested that the Gospel written by a publican would be a Gospel of systematic arrangement. As compared with the other synoptics it well deserves this name. E. A. Thomson says of it: "It has a methodical arrangement; such as we should expect from one who, as a collector of taxes, had been a man of business, trained to system and exactness. Matthew does not run on in the order of time, as a mere annalist, but groups discourses, parables, miracles, and prophecies by themselves, in a topical order, and with a certain power of combination that produces an admirable effect." [179] Godet, with his usual poetic insight and scientific accuracy, has put the same truth in these words: "Luke is in each case like a botanist who prefers to contemplate a flower in the very place of its birth, and in the midst of its natural surroundings. Matthew is like the gardener who, with a view to some special object, puts together large and magnificent bouquets." [180]

As examples of these bouquets, we notice: (1) This is the Gospel of the nine beatitudes. There are three times three of them; and no equal cluster can be found in any of

[179] The Four Evangelists, p. 24.

[180] New Testament Studies, p. 16.

the other evangelists. Luke has four beatitudes in one group, and four woes to counterbalance them.

(2) This is the Gospel of seven consecutive parables, in chapter thirteen. They are all parables of the Kingdom. Six of them begin with the statement, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto —." The first alone lacks this formula, and it, the parable of the sower, is introductory to the history of the Kingdom. Jesus sows the seed, makes the beginning. Then the Kingdom in its development and history and consummation is pictured in the six succeeding parables. Four of these parables Jesus gave to the multitude: the remaining three he gave to the disciples alone.

The number seven stands for completeness, and these seven parables give us the foundation, the fortunes, and the final fate of the Kingdom. The sower and his seed present the beginning experiences of the Kingdom; the tares, its appearance through all its earth history; the mustard seed, its marvelous growth; the leaven, its all-pervading and perfect victory; the treasure, its incomparable value; the pearl, its supreme reward of any sacrifice made for it; the drag-net, the end of its earth history. It is a bouquet of flowers, a cluster of gems, a galaxy of stars. No group of equal beauty and worth can be found in any other Gospel.

(3) This is the Gospel of ten consecutive miracles. One half of the miracles which Matthew records are found grouped in the eighth and ninth chapters. A leper is cleansed, a paralytic is instantly cured, a fever is cooled and routed at His touch, demons are expelled, stormy waves are quieted at his command, the dead is brought back to life, the blind are restored to sight, the dumb recovers his speech, all manner of disease and all manner of sickness is healed. How are these marvels accomplished? By the touch of his hand, by a word of command, usually in his presence, but sometimes at a distance. Matthew masses them together, that ten such narratives in close succession may convince all men that this is in very truth the Messiah.

(4) This is the Gospel of five continuous discourses. We will look at these later. We simply notice them now as groups of consecutive sayings of Jesus which are not to be paralleled in the other Gospels.

Matthew evidently is not careful to be chronological in the record of his material. He prefers to group together sayings and doings from various places and times into impressive, massive aggregations. He systematizes his material, arranges it under suitable heads, presents it on the topical principle. For example, in chapters five to seven we have Jesus presenting the constitution of the Kingdom; in chapters eight and nine, Jesus the miracle-working King over disease and devils and death, over nature and man; in chapter ten, Jesus the Master of the twelve; in chapter eleven, Jesus answering the doubt of the Baptist and the unbelief of the Galilæan cities; in chapter twelve Jesus confuting his adversaries; in chapter thirteen, Jesus presenting the Kingdom in parables.

Matthew begins his record of miracles with the cure of the leper, a symbol of cleansing from sin, and he closes it with the blasting of the fig-tree, a symbol of judgment upon sin. He begins his record of the parables with the sower scattering his seed, the preaching of the good news of the Kingdom to men, and he closes it with the parable of the talents, setting forth the sure judgment upon men according to their use of the Kingdom's privileges. There is seeming intent in this arrangement. Matthew is not following the order of events so much as the order of his own purpose and plan. This systematic arrangement is apparent in Matthew's preference for the sacred numbers, three and seven. The Gospel of Systematic Arrangement becomes the Gospel of the Sacred Numbers.

12. This is *The Gospel of the Threes and Sevens.*

(1) In the first chapter we have a genealogy which is not an accurate genealogy. The names are grouped into three divisions of fourteen, so that the name of Jesus comes as the

seventh name at the end of six sevens. In order to make this grouping of three fourteens, three times two times seven, Matthew has omitted several names from the list. Why has he done it? It has been suggested that Matthew is making a sort of numerical acrostic on the name David. In the Hebrew name "David," דוד, there are three letters, and the numerical value of the three letters is 4+6+4=14, and this value is multiplied by the sum of units, 14×3, to make the total. It is an artificial procedure, but thoroughly Jewish; and in this way Matthew makes his genealogy show that Jesus is in truth the son of David.[181]

It has been suggested, again, that the number of stations recorded in the wilderness journeying of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan was forty-two; and Matthew gives forty-two names in his genealogical list in order to point out the fact that the pilgrim people of God, starting from Abraham the father of the faithful, did not find the object of their faith and the final resting place of their hope until they came in the forty-second generation to Jesus. The discovery of these ingenious parallels would have astonished Matthew in all probability, and they do not seem very convincing to us. We know no better reason for this arrangement of threes and sevens than Matthew's evident Jewish fondness for these numbers.

(2) Notice the seven petitions in the Disciples' Prayer. Luke has only five of them. We are told that Matthew's sevens are usually divisible into fours and threes, setting forth the human and the divine aspects of the matter involved. This division is clearly apparent in the petitions of the Disciples' Prayer. Three of them are for the divine glory, "Hallowed be thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done," and four are for our human need: "Give us bread, forgive our sins, lead us not into temptation, deliver us from the evil one."

[181] So, Gfrörer, Die heilige Saga, II, p. 9 note; and G. H. Box, The Interpreter, vol. ii, p. 199.

(3) There are seven beatitudes which have to do with personal character. The other two pronounce beatitudes upon those who are persecuted because they have the character set forth in the preceding seven. Of these, the first four present characteristics of our humanity: poor in spirit, mourning, meek, hungering and thirsting after righteousness. The promise is that such shall be filled: and when they are filled they become partakers of the divine nature and may exercise some of the divine prerogatives. The other three beatitudes mount from the human to the divine plane of blessedness. They who experience them are merciful even as the Father is merciful, are pure even as God is pure, are peacemakers even as God is the God of peace.

(4) In the thirteenth chapter there are the seven parables of the kingdom. (5) In the twenty-third chapter there are the seven woes.

(6) We think there are seven clear divisions of the book, as we shall see when we come to outline its contents. (7) We recall further the seven demons of 12. 45, the seven fold forgiveness of 18. 21, 22, the seven brethren of 22. 25, the seven loaves and the seven baskets of fragments in 15. 34, 37.

The threes are more numerous than the sevens. We note a partial list of them, three fourteens in the genealogy, 1. 17; three incidents in the infancy—the visit of the Wise Men, the flight into Egypt, and the return to Nazareth, 2. 1-23; three narratives prior to the public ministry, 3. 1 to 4. 11; three temptations, 4. 1-11; three commands concerning religious acts—alms, prayer, and fasting, 6. 1-18; three prohibitions, 6. 19 to 7. 6; three prayer promises, 7. 7; three exhortations, 7. 7-15; a threefold "in thy name," 7. 22; three miracles of healing—leprosy, paralysis, fever, 8. 1-15; three miracles of power—in the natural, demonic, and spiritual spheres, 8. 23 to 9. 8; three miracles of restoration—to life, sight, and speech, 9. 18-33; three times, "Fear not," 10. 26, 28, 31; three answers to the question about fasting,

9. 14-17; three times, "is not worthy of me," 10. 37, 38; three signs to the Pharisees—Jonah, Ninevites, Queen of the South, 12. 38-42; three parables of the fields—sower, tares, mustard seed, 13. 1-32; three sayings about the "little ones," 18. 6, 10, 14; three parables of prophetic import, 21. 28 to 22. 14; three questions put to Jesus, 22. 15-40; three parables of warning, 24. 43 to 25. 30; three prayers in Gethsemane, 26. 39-44; three denials of Peter, 26. 69-75; three questions of Pilate, 27. 17, 22, 23; the last words to the disciples—a claim, a charge, a promise; and of these the charge a threefold charge, to make disciples, to baptize, and to teach; and of these the baptism to be into the threefold name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, 28. 18-20.

Some of these occurrences of the Jewish sacred numbers are easily accounted for on other grounds, but some of them seem in both the usage of Jesus and of Matthew to evidence the Jewish preference for these triple and septiform groups. All Jews were prone to make use of them, and Matthew in his Gospel followed the custom which was most natural to himself and which was most acceptable to his race. Possibly we may find another Jewish trait in the first Gospel in its record of divine guidance in dreams.

13. This is *The Gospel of Dreams.*

No other evangelist records any dreams, but Matthew introduces six of them into his narrative. We know that in the Old Testament the dream was considered one legitimate and, indeed, ordinary method of the communication of the divine will. We read that "when Saul inquired of Jehovah, Jehovah answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." [182] We read that Jehovah spake to Moses mouth to mouth, but he promised to speak to the other prophets in Israel in visions and dreams.[183] We remember that promise quoted by Peter at Pentecost: "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall

[182] 1 Sam. 28. 6.

[183] Num. 12. 6.

dream dreams, your young men shall see visions."[184] It was an Old Testament promise, but Peter declared that it was to be fulfilled in New Testament times. Matthew seems to have been of the same opinion.

In the early pages of the Old Testament we have the story of Joseph the dreamer. He had wonderful visions, and they brought him both into great difficulties and into great deliverances. We owe it to Matthew that on the first pages of our New Testament we find the story of another Joseph the dreamer. He too has strange visions and they bring him into great distress while at the same time they promise him great deliverance.

(1) He was a righteous man, and he had a righteous man's dreams. When he was minded to put Mary away the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and told him she was to be the mother of the Saviour of men.[185] It is not every man who sees an angel in his dream. No other man ever had such a message.

(2) When Herod sought to take the young child's life the Lord himself appeared to Joseph in a dream and warned him to flee into Egypt.[186]

(3) Again the angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, telling him to take the young child and his mother and return into the land of Israel.[187]

(4) Another dream warned Joseph to withdraw into Galilee, and it was thus that Jesus became a Nazarene.[188] Thus we see that at every important crisis in this time of his life Joseph was guided by dreams. It surely is an interesting fact that no other evangelist has recorded any of these things.

(5) Matthew has put two other most important revelations in dreams into his narrative, and both of them are recorded only by him. These were both granted to Gentiles.

[184] Joel 2. 28.
[185] Matt. 1. 20.
[186] Matt. 2. 13.
[187] Matt. 2. 19, 20.
[188] Matt. 2. 23.

The Wise Men had found Jesus in Bethlehem. Then being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way.[189]

(6) Pilate sat upon the judgment seat and the people were insisting upon the execution of Jesus. Then his wife, Claudia Procla, sent to him, saying, "Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." [190] Five times at the beginning of the Gospel and once again at the close of the Gospel divine direction is given in a dream. Since nothing corresponding to these dreams is recorded in any of the other Gospels, we may call the First Gospel the Gospel of Dreams.

14. This is *The Gospel of the Five Great Discourses.*

Each of these five great discourses is followed by the formula, "And when Jesus had finished these sayings."

(1) There is the Sermon on the Mount, chapters five to seven, in which Jesus "lays down the high spiritual laws of the kingdom of heaven. There are no rolling clouds as at Sinai, no crashing thunder, no careering fires, no congregated wings of the rushing angelic host; yet this Galilæan hill, with its calm voice, its lowly Teacher, its listening multitude, its lilies sprinkled on the green grass, is the Sinai of the New Covenant. Those beatitudes are its Decalogue, those virtues its ritual. Prayer and alms, holiness and humbleness of heart, there you have the Leviticus of Christianity, the Pentateuch of spiritual worship." [191]

(2) The instruction of the twelve apostles, chapter ten.

(3) The Kingdom presented in parables, chapter thirteen.

(4) The constitution of the Church, chapter eighteen.

(5) The eschatological prophecies and parables, chapters twenty-four and twenty-five. These five discourses set forth the new law, the new apostolate, the new Kingdom, the new

[189] Matt. 2. 12.
[190] Matt. 27. 19.
[191] Farrar, *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

church, the consummation of all things. These doubtless formed the main topics of the preaching and teaching of Jesus.

Sir John Hawkins says, "It is hard to believe that it is by accident that we find in a writer with the Jewish affinities of Matthew this five-times repeated formula, When Jesus had finished these sayings," and he calls attention to the parallel divisions in the five books of the Pentateuch, the five books of the Psalms, the five Megilloth, and other similar groups. We remember that Eusebius tells us that Papias wrote a commentary on the Logia of Matthew in five books, and we wonder if these Five Great Discourses with their identical concluding formula may not represent the original five-fold division of that book.

There are, however, many other smaller discourses of Jesus recorded by Matthew which are only less valuable than the great discourses we have named. The eleventh chapter has the eulogy upon John the Baptist, the woes upon the Galilæan cities, the thanksgiving for the revelation to babes, the invitation to the heavy-laden. The twelfth chapter has the sayings about the observance of the Sabbath and the unpardonable sin and idle words and sign-seeking. The fifteenth chapter has the attack upon the traditions of the elders and the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. The sixteenth chapter has the promise of the keys and the prophecy of the crucifixion. The nineteenth chapter contains the discussion concerning divorce and the peril of riches. The twentieth and twenty-first chapters have the parables of impending judgment. The twenty-third chapter has the denunciation of the ecclesiastical authorities and almost deserves to rank in importance with the five great discourses of the Gospel. One fourth of the contents of the first Gospel is represented by these discourses, and distinguish it, as the didactic Gospel, from the other synoptics. We see Jesus as a popular orator in these pages, and have examples of the addresses which gave him his reputation and power with the people. The

first Gospel is like the fourth in giving so much of its space to the discourses of Jesus.

15. This is *The Gospel of the Four Great Mountains.*

These mountains mark the four culminating points in the ministry of Jesus.

(1) The mount of the beatitudes. "Seeing the multitudes, Jesus went up into the mountain," [192] and there he sat down and preached the mountain sermon of the Christian faith, filled with far-reaching visions as from mountain heights and lofty ideals like mountain peaks.

(2) The mount of transfiguration. "Jesus taketh with him Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart." [193] It was a mountain of prayer and a mountain of vision, a mountain of the Divine Presence, a "holy mount," [194] where glorified spirits were seen and a voice was borne from the Majestic Glory out of heaven to men.

(3) The mount of prophecy. "As he sat on the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be?" [195] From that mountain could he look back to the mount of transfiguration and see that all which had been said there concerning his decease was now about to come true? Could he look farther still, back to the mount of the great sermon where he had laid down the foundation principles upon which his kingdom forever must stand? Did the gladness of the first Galilæan ministry and the glory of the transfiguration fill his heart as he thought of the past? Or, on this mount did he look forward only, and was his heart filled with dismay as he thought of all his disciples must endure until the end of the age? He said to them, "When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation . . . standing in the holy place,

[192] Matt. 5. 1.
[193] Matt. 17. 1.
[194] 2 Pet. 1. 18.
[195] Matt. 24. 3.

. . . then let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains." [196] There they would find a place of refuge, where he had found peace so often for his soul. In the mountains God and heaven would seem nearer, prayer would be easier, and they could see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

(4) In this Gospel the last appearance of Jesus is on a mountain top. "The eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." [197] There Jesus showed them all the kingdoms of the earth and the glory of them, and he told them that all these things belonged to him and he could give them to whomsoever he would, and he commanded them to go forth and take possession of them all in his name. All authority was his, and he would give it all to those who would fall down and worship him in spirit and in truth. If they obeyed him and taught what he commanded, he would be with them unto the consummation of the age. Had not the angel said to Joseph that the promise given through Isaiah would be fulfilled in Mary's son, "They shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us"? Now the Messiah assures his disciples that that promise, fulfilled in his presence with them through his ministry, would continue to be fulfilled forevermore: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Did Jesus think as he said these things of that vision in the wilderness in which the devil had taken him unto an exceeding high mountain and tempted him with the promise of an easy conquest of the authority he had gained now through crucifixion? He did not deceive his disciples with any promise of easy victory: but he promised victory through obedience, even if obedience should be learned through suffering. It had been a hard road to travel from that mount of temptation to this mount of the great commis-

[196] Matt. 24. 15, 16.
[197] Matt. 28. 16.

sion. There had been both tribulation and transfiguration upon the way; but now his work was done; and the victory had been won. Upon this mountain-top he makes public proclamation of that fact; and it is upon this mountain-top of resurrected and unrivaled authority that Matthew leaves him.

Beside these four mountains of the high points of the ministry of Jesus, Matthew has (5) the mountain of the temptation vision, 4. 8; (6) the mountain of prayer, 14. 23; (7) the mountain of healing, 15. 29; and (8) the mount of Olives, from which Jesus descended to the triumphal entry, 21. 1, on which he uttered his great prophecy, 24. 3, and to which he went last of all on the night of his betrayal, 26. 30. Jesus speaks (9) of the mountain crowned with a city, 5. 14; (10) the mountain of the lost sheep, 18. 12; (11) the mountains of refuge, 24. 16; and (12) the mountain removed by prayer, 17. 20; 21. 21.

There is something of mountain grandeur in this Gospel, much of the freshness of atmosphere and the clearness of vision which is characteristic of the mountain height. Jesus loved the mountains, and it would seem that Matthew did too. He has more to say of the mountains in this Gospel than can be found in any of the other three. We call it the Gospel of the Great Mountains in the ministry of Jesus.

IV. The Man and the Book

The characteristics of the book are clearly before us now. Do they not correspond most closely with the character of the man? The Gospel according to Matthew is just such a Gospel as Matthew would have been most likely to write. He was a Jew who never had lost his sense of relationship to his own people, and whose primary interest was in proving to his fellow countrymen that Jesus his Master was their Messiah, the expected King whose royal authority had inaugurated the kingdom prophesied in the Old Testament, a kingdom of this earth, but a kingdom of the heavens too.

He had been a social outcast and had gained a sympathy for all beyond the Jewish pale, such as a Jew who never had been under the social ban and never had companied with Jesus would not be likely to have. The bitterness of spirit inevitable to such a social ostracism as he had experienced is apparent in his ever-recurrent pessimism and gloom. The hand of the publican is manifest in many minor particulars and in the general love of order and of systematic arrangement which has its parallel in the love of righteousness in everything and in every one and in the peculiar disposition toward discipline and ecclesiastical recognition, so characteristic of both the Gospel and the man. There is scarcely a feature of the book which does not correspond with some feature of Matthew's peculiar personality.

All of the gospel writers have the same story to tell, yet how differently they tell it! The reason for the difference between their narratives is to be found, not in the subject whom they portray, nor in the inspiration which they received from him and his words and his life, but in themselves. It is the same white light refracted through many prisms. It is the same white life reflected through several minds. Each writer has his individual idiosyncrasies. Each man has his personal preferences and prejudices. Each man has his particular impressions and his peculiar experiences and all of these things influence his thought and his writing.

The two great facts about Matthew were that he had been a publican and that he was an apostle. What sort of a Gospel would an apostle who had been a publican write? Just such a Gospel as this. Therefore our study of the characteristics of the book leads us all the more readily to agree with the unanimous tradition of the ancient church as it was expressed by that greatest scholar of the first Christian centuries and the best authority among them upon all matters pertaining to critical investigation and purity of the faith. With Origen we say, "I have learned from tradition that the first Gospel was written by Matthew, who was once a

publican, but afterward an apostle of Jesus Christ," [198] and to this we add that the more we study the book the more we feel acquainted with the man and the more certain we are that, however much the book may have been edited in later days, it still bears plainly impressed upon it the personality of the publican apostle. As H. H. B. Ayles has said, "The early and unanimous tradition of the church assigns the first Gospel to Matthew, and there is no explanation of this tradition except that it expresses the actual fact." [199]

This may be a good place to note the fact that the same authorities who tell us that Matthew was responsible for this Gospel say also that he wrote it in Hebrew. For example, Origen, from whom we have just quoted, continues his report of the tradition in his day to the effect that the first Gospel "was prepared for the converts from Judaism, and published in the Hebrew language." [200] This tradition of an original Hebrew edition of the Gospel goes back to Papias, who is quoted by Eusebius as saying, "Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew language, and every one interpreted them as he was able." [201] Irenæus makes the same assertion concerning the original Hebrew,[202] and his statement is confirmed by Pantænus,[203] Origen,[204] Jerome,[205] Cyril of Jerusalem,[206] Epiphanius,[207] and Augustine.[208]

[198] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., VI, 25. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. i, p. 273.

[199] Interpreter, vol. xii, p. 273.

[200] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., VI, 25. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. i, p. 273.

[201] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles, III, 39. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, i, p. 173.

[202] Adv. Haer., III, 1. Eusebius, V, 8. 2.

[203] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, V, 10. 3.

[204] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, VI, 25.

[205] Jerome, De vir. ill., 3, 36.

[206] Catechet., 14.

[207] Haer., xxx, 3.

[208] Consensus evangelistorum, I, 2. 4.

Most modern scholars agree that this testimony cannot be set aside, and that we must conclude that Matthew wrote the Logia at least, and possibly a complete Gospel narrative in the Aramaic or the Hebrew. They also agree that the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" of which we have only a few fragments in Latin and Greek cannot be proved to have any connection with our first Gospel, and it is doubtful if Matthew the Apostle had anything to do with that work. There is also a general agreement that our canonical Matthew is not a translation from the Hebrew, but was written originally in Greek. This is the conclusion of Alford, Allen, Beza, Bleek, Calvin, Credner, Davidson, Delitzsch, Dods, Ellicott, Erasmus, Ewald, Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Hug, Jülicher, Keil, Keim, Köstlin, McGiffert, Morison, Lightfoot, Lardner, Paulus, Reuss, Ritschl, Roberts, Salmon, Schott, Stuart, Tischendorf, Thomson, Weiss, Wilke, Wetstein, De Wette, Zahn.

Since all ancient tradition is unanimous in ascribing our first Gospel to Matthew and in saying that he wrote the Gospel originally in Hebrew, it follows that an original Hebrew Gospel written by Matthew is now lost, and that at some later date he must have written the Gospel again in Greek. This Greek Gospel was not a translation from the Hebrew, but it may have paralleled the other very closely and it must have superseded it entirely after a time.[209] The tradition of the Matthean authorship would not have attached itself to this Greek Gospel without good reason. The most simple and sufficient reason would be that he himself was known to have been concerned in its composition. We think that we are in a position now to appeal with all confidence to the internal evidence furnished by the book itself in support of the external tradition.

The characteristics of the book are the characteristics of the man. We scarcely could conceive of a book which

[209] So, Bengel, Benson, Bloomfield, Horne, Lee, Ellicott, Guericke, Olshausen, Thiersch, and Schaff.

would answer more perfectly to all which we know of Matthew the man. Therefore, when we find the best modern criticism agreeing upon the "strong individuality" in this book and the "clear purpose" running through it, the "uniform character" of its composition[210] and the "consistency of its representation," we conclude that it cannot be a mere compilation from many and various sources, but that one personality has impressed itself upon the whole work, and our study has made it clear that no other personality would meet all the requirements of the case as well as that of Matthew, to whom all the early tradition in the church uniformly ascribed it.

We are ready, then, to agree with one of the most recent writers upon the subject of Gospel Origins when he makes the general statements that "from the time when the Gospels began to circulate or to be appealed to, it was the common tradition of the Christian Church that they were written by those whose names they bear," and "this tradition rested upon no claim made within the books themselves, and the only possible explanation of it is that the tradition rested upon facts so clearly within the cognizance of the Christian Church that denial of the received authorship was held to be impossible."[211] We may conclude with this author that this tradition does not solve any or all of the details of the Synoptic Problem for us; and while we postpone the discussion of these for the present, we hold fast to the fundamental truth that in the case of each Gospel we have one name, and only one name, attached as author, and that in the case of the first Gospel the name of the author and the character of the man correspond with

---

[210] Réville: "These favorite constructions entwine the whole book in a net evidently stretched by one and the same hand." Credner, to like effect: "These peculiar modes of expression, which uniformly recur in the whole course of the writing, show the unity of the author."

[211] Holdsworth, Gospel Origins, p. 23.

the characteristics of the book with an astonishing exactness and perfection.

V. Peculiar Portions

We notice at this point some of the sections in this Gospel which are not paralleled in any of the other Gospel records.

1. The four events of the infancy history given in the second chapter: the visit of the Wise Men, the slaughter of the innocents, the flight into Egypt, and the return to Nazareth.

2. Matthew records thirty-three miracles, and three of them are found in the first Gospel alone: the healing of the two blind men, chapter nine; Peter walking on the water, chapter fourteen; and the coin in the fish's mouth, if there is any miracle implied in this narrative, chapter seventeen.

3. There are fifteen parables in this Gospel, and ten of them are not found elsewhere: the tares, the hid treasure, the pearl of great price, and the dragnet, chapter thirteen; the unmerciful servant, chapter eighteen; the laborers in the vineyard, chapter twenty; the two sons, chapter twenty-one; the marriage of the king's son, chapter twenty-two; the ten virgins and the talents, chapter twenty-five.

4. There are at least seven important incidents connected with the Passion and resurrection week which Matthew alone has recorded: the bargain of Judas, chapter twenty-six; the suicide of Judas, the dream of Pilate's wife, the resurrection of the departed saints, and the watch set at the sepulcher, chapter twenty-seven; the Sanhedrin explanation of the open tomb, and the earthquake on the resurrection morning, chapter twenty-eight.

We have noticed the greater and smaller discourses recorded by Matthew alone, and we have seen that the phrases, "it is fulfilled," "in order that it may be fulfilled," "in order that the thing spoken may be fulfilled" are characteristic of Matthew's use, as is the phrase, "the kingdom of the heavens" and the word "church." "The kingdom of

the heavens" is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. "The church" occurs one hundred and eleven times in the epistles and the book of Acts, but it is not found in any other Gospel. These characteristic phrases are not found in any one portion of the book, but are scattered throughout, and they bear their witness to the literary unity of the composition. One hand has gone carefully over the whole and made it a single articulated work; and it does not seem so likely that these phrases would be foisted into the narrative by an editor as that they would belong to the original text furnished by the author.

VI. The Aim of the Gospel

John David Michaelis said, "He who does not know exactly the aim that each apostle set before him in writing his Gospel or his letter will never understand that writing completely." We are ready now to ask what aim Matthew set before him in the composition of his book. Some critics have found the first Gospel a book of strange contradictions and have been unable to believe in its unity of authorship or singleness of aim. Others, like Bernhard Weiss and Ernest Burton and Frederic Godet, have no difficulty in discerning the purpose of the book.

Matthew writes for the Jews, and he shows them clearly that Jesus was the Messias promised in their own Scriptures, but, unrecognized and rejected and crucified by themselves, he, the Jewish Messias, had become the head of a church partly Jewish but largely Gentile and destined to include all the races of men. The disciples of Jesus represented the true Israel, whether they were Gentiles or Jews. All Jews who were not Christians were no longer members of the church of God.

Matthew's book, therefore, was more than a history. It was an attack upon all the existing Jewish ecclesiasticism. Matthew said to all the religious authorities of his day and to all unbelieving Jews: "You have crucified your own

Messias. We welcomed him and are true to him still. You are the deserters; we have stood by the truth. All the Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled in him, not simply single prophecies, but all of them. However, they were fulfilled contrary to expectation. Jesus came from Galilee, not from Judæa. He lived in Nazareth and not in Bethlehem. He was a humble Teacher and not a conquering King. He was the Suffering Servant of Jehovah and not the Majestic Monarch of your dreams. The reason for this lies in your own guilt. Jesus was born at Bethlehem, and he was driven to Nazareth by the guilty, murderous plot of your own king. You yourselves made him a Galilæan; and in that way seemingly contradictory prophecies are fulfilled in him, as 'Out of Bethlehem shall he be called,' [212] and 'He will be a light in the borderland of Galilee.' [213] Hear, O Israel; believe, and be saved. You have rejected the Messias Here are the facts which prove that true. Repent, therefore, and accept him, or take the consequences upon your own heads. You will be rejected by him in his turn and your kingdom will pass into other hands."

The first Gospel had something of the character of an official ultimatum. It was a last call of Jehovah to his people: "This is my beloved Son; hear him and obey him, or perish in the swift judgment coming upon your city and race." This book then is half law and half gospel. It closes the Old Testament as it opens the New. It bridges the chasm between the old and the new dispensations. It shows that the memories and the hopes of God's people are to find their consummation in one man, the Lord of the Christians and the Messias of the Jews.

The first Gospel was not the first book of the New Testament to be written. It probably was not the first of the Gospels to be written, yet it stands appropriately first in our New Testament canon. Matthew shows that God's eternal

[212] Matt. 2. 6.

[213] Matt. 4. 15, 16.

purpose has not been thwarted but consummated in the life and death of Jesus. Christianity is the fulfillment of the Old Testament faith. The words of Jesus in the great sermon, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil," [214] might have been written on the title-page as the motto of the book.

Its aim is both apologetic and polemic. It defends the Christian position. It defies the Jewish anti-Christian campaign. It appeals to the Christians to be loyal to Jesus even though it may seem disloyalty to their own people to be so. In the overwhelming calamities which were coming upon the Jews they must choose between loyalty to their race and loyalty to him. The race was doomed: salvation could be found only in the resurrected Lord.

VII. The Gospel's Affinities Among the New Testament Books

The spirit and purpose of the Gospel according to Matthew ally it most closely with those New Testament books which were written for Jewish Christians or represented the tone and attitude of the Jewish Christian Church.

1. The Epistle to the Hebrews has much the same general aim. It endeavors to prove to the Christians among the Hebrews that in spite of all appearances and all disappointments they had the better of their unbelieving countrymen, and, if the worst came to the worst, they would be justified in going out of the camp with Jesus their Lord. Paul thought good Christians might be good Jews as well. Matthew and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews saw clearly that the time was near at hand when a choice must be made and the loyal Christian would find it necessary to break with the peculiar rites and the temple worship of his race. Both books are apologetical and polemical. They persuade the Jews to be Christians by proving that Christian Jews have infinitely the better of the bargain, for they alone

[214] Matt. 5. 17.

have the fulfillment of the nation's hope and the assurance of salvation in the nation's Messiah.

2. The Epistle of James is probably the most Jewish of the New Testament Epistles. It makes no mention of the incarnation or redemption or the resurrection and ascension. It has so few distinctively Christian elements in it that one modern critic has decided that it is a purely Jewish writing which has crept in among the Christian books. The word "gospel" does not occur in this Jewish epistle; but we are not surprised to find that it has many points of contact with the Gospel according to Matthew, the Jewish Gospel. There are at least ten passages which parallel the teachings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. Nowhere else in the New Testament can we find so many allusions to this sermon in the same limited space. The whole epistle breathes the spirit of the teachings of Jesus, as recorded by Matthew. There are the same ethical standards. There is the same sternness of rebuke for wrongdoers. There is the same sympathy for the wronged. We conclude that Matthew must have given us a true picture of Jesus when we find that James, his brother, thinks and speaks so much like him. The affinities between these two books help to substantiate the claims of each to authenticity.

3. There is one other book in the New Testament which seems akin to the first Gospel in its Jewish undertone and general spirit. That is the closing book of the canon, the Apocalypse of John. In the Encyclopædia Britannica Edwin Abbott says of the first Gospel that it "lays special stress upon the sin of religious ostentation and hypocrisy," and he further characterizes it by saying, "Matthew, more than the rest of the evangelists, seems to move in evil days, and amid a race of backsliders, among dogs and swine who are unworthy of the pearls of truth, among the tares sown by the enemy, among fishermen who have to cast back many of the fish caught in the net of the gospel; the broad way is ever in his mind, and the multitude of those that go

thereby, and the guest without the wedding garment, and the foolish virgins, and the goats as well as the sheep, and those who even cast out devils in the name of the Lord, and yet are rejected by him because they work lawlessness." [215]

We are reminded of the synagogue of Satan in the Apocalypse, composed of those who say they are Jews, and they are not, but do lie.[216] We are reminded of the Laodiceans who said they were rich and had need of nothing, when they were wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked.[217] We remember that the whole Apocalypse is filled with wars and plagues and thunders and the vengeance of God upon all his adversaries. We find that the woes of the twenty-third chapter of Matthew have their apocalyptic counterpart in the woes of the ninth, eleventh, and eighteenth chapters of this book. We find that the Apocalypse is built upon Old Testament allusions and phraseology, and is saturated with the Old Testament spirit to a fuller extent than any other book in the New, and we remember that Matthew makes the first Gospel a Gospel of the fulfillment of Old Testament promises and prophecies; and we see in this constant reference to the Old Testament another link of resemblance between the two. These four books—the Gospel according to Matthew, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the Apocalypse of John—are Jewish-Christian books, with a fuller emphasis upon the Jewish side of the equation than is to be found in any of the other New Testament books. From this point of view they form a class by themselves. As the Gospel for the Jews the first Gospel has closest affinities with this group of New Testament books.

VIII. Outline of the Gospel

Professor Moorehead suggests a simple outline. "1. The

[215] Ninth edition, vol. x, p. 715.

[216] Rev. 3. 9.

[217] Rev. 3. 17.

King's birth, chapters 1-2. 2. The Kingdom proclaimed, chapters 3-7. 3. The King's ways and works, chapters 8-12. 4. The mysteries of the Kingdom, chapters 13-20. 5. The King rejected, chapters 21-23. 6. The coming and judgment of the King, chapters 24-25. 7. Salvation through the death and resurrection of the King, chapters 26-28." [218]

From the lectures of Bernhard Weiss in Berlin we reproduce this more elaborate outline: 1. The Son of David is born in Bethlehem and through the guilt of Israel is driven to Nazareth, chapters 1-2. 2. Jesus through the guilt of Israel is made the servant of the heathen, 3. 1 to 4. 12. 3. Jesus proves himself a prophet in Israel, mighty in word and in deed, 4. 13 to 9. 35. 4. Jesus through his disciples provides for Israel, 9. 36 to 13. 53. 5. Jesus devotes himself to the instruction of his disciples, as the beginners and founders of the future church, 13. 54 to 20. 16. 6. Jesus stands before death with freedom and consciousness, ready to seal his Messiahship, 20. 17 to 25. 46. 7. Jesus put to death. He becomes King of his church which shall be gathered out of all peoples, while Israel through its own guilt is rejected, 26. 1 to 28. 20.

As President Weston has suggested, "The first book of the Old Testament records the calling out of a nation from which the Messiah should come; this first book of the New Testament records the calling out of a nation in which the Messiah shall dwell." [219] The story climaxes toward the close. The last chapters rise into epic grandeur. Robert Louis Stevenson said of them, "I believe that they will move and startle anyone, who will read them freshly like any other book." They have moved multitudes as no other chapters in the New Testament have. Tears have filled the eyes of those who read this matchless narrative of the closing scenes in the greatest of this world's tragedies. Matthew

[218] Studies in the Four Gospels, pp. 78, 79.

[219] Matthew, the Genesis of the New Testament, p. 34.

is usually as self-restrained as any bookkeeper or any mere annalist, but at the close of this Gospel he astonishes us with his pathos and his power.

IX. Time and Place of Writing

Eusebius tells us that "of all the disciples of the Lord, only Matthew and John have left us written memorials, and they, tradition says, were led to write only under the pressure of necessity. For Matthew, who had at the first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to other peoples, committed his Gospel to writing . . . , and thus compensated those whom he was obliged to leave for the loss of his presence." [220] The Gospel speaks of "the holy city" and "the holy place," as if they were still in existence. Therefore both the church tradition and the internal evidence lead us to think that the book must have been written before the fall of Jerusalem. Keim says, "The book was written about the year A. D. 66." [221] Hug, Bleek, Ayles, Allen, Meyer, Holtzmann, Godet, Keim, Keil, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange, and others approximately agree.

At Jerusalem or in some city of Palestine Matthew probably wrote the most of the record of the life of his Lord before he began his foreign missionary labors. The actual publication may have been elsewhere. Weiss suggests Ephesus or Asia Minor.[222] Wright thinks that Alexandria or Egypt[223] satisfies the conditions. Allen prefers Antioch or Syria.[224] Sanday suggests Damascus or Antioch.[225] We have no data upon which to found any sure conclusion at this point.

Eusebius tells us that the Gospel according to Matthew

[220] III, 24. 6.
[221] I, 73.
[222] Introduction, II, p. 287.
[223] Interpreter, vol. ii, p. 247.
[224] Expository Times, vol. xxii, p. 350.
[225] Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p. 24.

was carried into the foreign missionary field in the days of the apostles. Bartholomew took it to India, and Pantænus found it there in later days, preserved among them with pious care.[226] Since the time of Pantænus it has gone about the world. It has been a blessing to all the nations. The name of Matthew has been cherished wherever the gospel of Christ has been preached. He wrote for the Jews, but the Gospel has been claimed by the Gentile races as well. The world has appreciated it. All time has added to its laurels. The publican who wrote it stands among the immortals. The power and the presence of his Master was with him in his writing and has been with his book through all the days.

Renan and Jülicher would seem to have been justified when they said it was the most important book of Christendom, and that it has exerted its enormous influence upon the church because it was written by a man who bore within himself the spirit of the growing Church Universal and who knew how to write a Gospel destined and fitted for all manner of believers.

---

[226] V, 10. 3.

PART II

THE MOST AUTHENTIC GOSPEL: THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

PART II

THE MOST AUTHENTIC GOSPEL: THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

I. The Author

The second Gospel always has been called the Gospel according to Mark. The "Mark" who was its author usually has been identified in church tradition with the "John Mark" mentioned in Acts 12. 12.[1] There we read that Peter when released from prison went to the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark. Accepting this identification as an authentic one, we notice first this rather unusual name.

1. *His Name.* Paul tells us that this man was a Jew.[2] Therefore his original name would be the Hebrew name "John." That name meant, "Jehovah is gracious." It also was the name of the author of the fourth Gospel. The second Gospel and the fourth Gospel were both written by "John." The first of the Gospels to be written and the last of the Gospels to be written bore this proclamation upon their forefront, "Jehovah is gracious." In the superscription of the author's name, if they had it, each declared that the gospel which followed would be a gospel of grace. The name of the author of the first Gospel had a like import. Matthew means, "the gift of Jehovah, Jehovah's gracious gift." The third Gospel has been distinguished from the others as the Gospel of Grace. It is full of words of grace

[1] This identification has been disputed by Grotius, Calovius, Cave, Tillemont and others; but modern scholarship is practically agreed upon it.

[2] Col. 4. 10, 11.

and deeds of grace. The four Gospels have this characteristic in common, that they set forth the grace of our God to all men. The names of the authors of three of them suggest this fact, and the character of the other evangelist exemplified it. Could this have had anything to do with their choice for this work?

When this second evangelist was born, his mother was grateful and said, "Jehovah is gracious to have given me a son. I will call his name John." Later, for some reason unknown, "John" had a surname added and was called "John Mark." This name "Mark" was a Roman name, a Gentile name. It was the Latin name "Marcus," meaning "a heavy hammer." There is some reason for thinking that Mark had some stump fingers, as we shall see later on. May it not be possible that he had met with some accident in his young manhood, in which a heavy hammer had fallen upon the fingers of his left hand and crushed the ends of two or more of them, and that the presence of that deformity and the memory of its cause was responsible for this surname? We do not know that the suggestion has been made by any one before, but in lack of any other certain explanation of this surname we may be content to let it stand.

Through all his later life this man answered to either name, "John" or "Mark," or to the double name, "John Mark." John was his name in early life. Mark seems to have become his more common name in later life. At times he was called John whose surname is Mark in his middle life. All these names appear in the New Testament. John alone is found in two passages in Acts.[3] The double name, John Mark, occurs three times in the Book of Acts.[4] The name "Mark" occurs alone five times, once in Acts, three times in the Pauline Epistles, and once in First Peter.[5]

[3] Acts 13. 5, 13.
[4] Acts 12. 12, 25; 15. 37.
[5] Acts 15. 39; Col. 4. 10; 2 Tim. 4. 11; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. 5. 13.

These passages with their context give us all the facts concerning John Mark's life contained in the New Testament. Before turning to these, however, let us notice that John Mark's name is half Hebrew and half Roman and marks its bearer as the man best fitted to introduce the gospel of the Hebrew Messias to the Roman world. The second Gospel is the gospel written by a Jew for the Latin race.

2. *Facts of His Life.* Mark's mother was Mary, one of the many Marys whose names stand for all that is good in the New Testament narratives. This Mary is the representative of open-handed and munificent hospitality. She probably was well-to-do. She had a home in Jerusalem, a home with a large enclosed porch before it,[6] and with a large assembly room inside it.[7] This room was thrown open for a prayer service, and many were gathered together in it. There may have been many servants in the home. We know that there was one maid whose duty it was to attend upon the door. This home seems to have been a sort of headquarters for the leaders of the Christian Church in Jerusalem. Peter went directly to this house when he was released from prison, and the maid who came to the door and heard his voice recognized it instantly.

Peter evidently was well known to all the inmates of that home, and it may have been his home when he was in Jerusalem. He calls Mark his "son"[8] and it has been thought that this term of intimate association and affection meant that Peter was responsible for Mark's conversion. Mark was his son in the gospel, we are told. We think it just as probable that Peter had lived in the home in Jerusalem with Mark until the older man had come to regard the younger man with all the intimate affection he could have given to a son of his own. If Mary was a widow, Peter may have been the responsible head of the household, and

[6] Acts 12. 13.
[7] Acts 12. 12.
[8] 1 Pet. 5. 13.

Mark may have come to seem to him as his son in that relationship.

Mary was related to Barnabas, a man of generous heart and ample means. The two may have shared the same family wealth, and they seem to have had much in common in their personal disposition. When Barnabas and Saul came to Jerusalem together they probably were entertained in Mary's home, for it was a hospitable home and Barnabas was a relative; and it was at this time that Mark left this home and went to Antioch with these men.[9] If they had been entertained in his home it would have been easier for him to go away with the two guests whom his mother had so honored and trusted and with whom he had thus become so well acquainted. Mark accompanied Barnabas and Paul on their first missionary journey.[10] He gave promise of very valuable assistance to them.

In his home he had been thrown into constant association with Peter and the other disciples of Jesus, and for ten years there his mind had been stored with rich treasure of reminiscence of their narratives concerning the work and the words of the Master. Paul was wholly lacking at this point, and Barnabas probably never had had the opportunities which Mark had enjoyed. Wherever they went Mark could be their surety for the facts upon which all their gospel preaching was based. He could quote the testimony of eye-witnesses for all the incidents of the marvelous history. At first they were not disappointed in him; but at Perga in Pamphylia Mark determined, for some reason which must have seemed sufficient to him and which seemed altogether insufficient to Paul, that it was high time for him to break with the missionary expedition and return to his home in Jerusalem.[11]

Barnabas and Paul went on alone. After the first mis-

[9] Acts 12. 25.
[10] Acts 13. 5.
[11] Acts 13. 13.

sionary journey they came back to Antioch, and after they had gone down to Jerusalem and in all probability had been entertained again in Mary's hospitable home, they made another short stay in Antioch; and then Paul proposed that they go again upon a missionary tour. Barnabas agreed, and he was minded to take with them John Mark. Two years had passed, and Mark may have been a better man by this time; but Paul was unwilling to risk a second desertion on his part. He called him an apostate, and declared he would have nothing more to do with such a man. Barnabas defended his cousin as well as he could. The discussion waxed warm, and at last there was a paroxysm of rage on the part of one or both of them,[12] and Paul preferred to part company with Barnabas rather than to be forced to keep company with Mark.

Eleven years later Paul either had repented his decision concerning Mark or Mark had so improved in character that he felt warranted in restoring him to his favor. Paul calls him a "fellow worker" in the Epistle to Philemon,[13] and in the Epistle to the Colossians he declares that Mark has been "a comfort" to him.[14] Later still he tells Timothy that Mark is "useful to him for ministering." [15] From the salutation appended to Peter's epistle we learn that Mark was associated with Peter at the time his epistle was written.[16]

These are the facts recorded in the New Testament concerning Mark. We have his mother's name, and are given some glimpse of his home in Jerusalem. We know that he became associated in ministerial and missionary work with three of the great leaders of the early Christian Church, namely, Barnabas, Peter, and Paul. Barnabas was his

[12] *ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμός*, Acts 15. 39.
[13] Philem. 24.
[14] Col. 4. 11.
[15] 2 Tim. 4. 11.
[16] 1 Pet. 5. 13.

cousin,[17] and he probably was kindly disposed toward Mark for that reason. Peter may have sympathized with him because he found that they were much alike in personal character, so much so that they might have been father and son. Was it pure fickleness which led Mark to desert Barnabas and Paul on that first missionary journey? Paul would not have forgiven him if he had had no better reason for going home at that time than that he had changed his mind. Peter would have found a bond of sympathy in any such incident. He had changed his mind so often himself that he could easily forgive anyone else for doing it.

Peter was more willing to bear with weak and vacillating brethren than Paul was. It was his commission to strengthen the brethren.[18] He prayed the God of all grace to perfect, establish, strengthen, and settle all who were imperfect and needed stability.[19] To Paul's mind stability was an essential to respectability. He would not fellowship with anyone who lacked it. When Peter changed his mind there at Antioch and Barnabas was carried away into the dissimulation, Paul withstood them to the face. He declared that they were traitors to the truth of the gospel, and he would have nothing to do with them until they repented and had approved themselves again.[20] When Mark proved apostate at Perga in Pamphylia, Paul was ready to cut him off at once. As long as Mark was unrepentant he would have nothing more to do with him. Mark must have proved himself repentant and faithful in the ministry before Paul finally acknowledged him as a fellow worker and found him a comfort and useful in attendant services.

Mark always appears in notable company in the New Testament, but always in a subordinate position. He is attendant, minister, interpreter, servant all the time. Each

[17] Col. 4. 10.
[18] Luke 22. 32.
[19] 1 Pet. 5. 10.
[20] Gal. 2. 11-18.

of the four symbols assigned to the four evangelists has been given to Mark by some one of the church Fathers, but the one most appropriate to his personal character and to the picture given of him in the New Testament is that of the ox. In early life he was somewhat immature, but in later life he was as serviceable as an ox. Upon the basis of the facts recorded in the New Testament what conception shall we form of the character of this man Mark?

3. *His Character.* We are disposed to think that Mark was the spoiled child of a wealthy widow. His mother lavished all her affection upon him. He had everything pretty much his own way in the home. He was reared in comparative luxury. He knew little or nothing of hardship, and he was not disposed to court any acquaintance with it. It was almost inevitable that he should be lacking in heroic fiber. When his mother became a devoted Christian, and Barnabas and Saul were entertained in her home, the young man became fired with enthusiasm for the new cause; but it was boyish enthusiasm, not like that of the older men. When Barnabas and Saul determined to go upon the first missionary journey Mark volunteered at once to accompany them. It was a romantic undertaking and there would be great adventure. He set out in high glee. At Perga in Pamphylia his enthusiasm had subsided, his missionary zeal had disappeared, his whole attitude toward the enterprise had changed, and he left Barnabas and Paul to go on without him while he went home to his mother.

At least four considerations may have had a share in bringing about this change of heart on the part of Mark.

(1) It may have been the first time that Mark had been away from home. He had not realized what life would be without a fond mother close at hand. Barnabas was kindly and Paul was well disposed, but neither of them could take the place of a mother. Mark got increasingly homesick all the time. Those who have had bad attacks of homesickness say that it is a terrible disease, and that those of us who

never have had it can have no conception of the miseries its victims endure. It was awful in the island of Cyprus, but Mark kept hoping that they would soon turn back home again. On they went the whole length of the island, and then, to Mark's utter dismay, they decided to set sail for Asia Minor. They were going still farther from home! They surely had gone far enough!

Mark may have been seasick on the way over. Anyway when they arrived at Perga he was so wretched that he had visions of a serious illness there in a strange land and of a lonely death before his mother would get the news of his condition and hasten to the bedside of her only son. There was that young man at Nain whom the Master had restored to his home, because he was the only son of his mother and she a widow. The more Mark thought about it the more certain he was that he ought to be restored to his home. He heard his mother calling to him in his sleep. He dreamed that he saw her weeping in her loneliness. He wept himself when he was awake at the thought of her sorrow and the poignant realization of his own distance from all the familiar comforts of home. Barnabas said to him: "Cheer up! I am here, and I will see that you come to no harm." "Yes," said Mark, "you are here; but where is my mother? Nobody can take the place of my mother." Paul said, "Come along! You will feel better after awhile. Nobody ever died of homesickness yet." Then Mark said to himself: "That settles it. He is a hard-hearted, unfeeling enthusiast. My mother never would talk to me like that. I am going back to my mother." He was young and lacked as yet the stamina necessary for missionary work.

(2) Added to this general feeling of homesickness there was the certainty that he must endure hardships and face dangers and suffer persecutions upon which he had not calculated, if he went any farther on this missionary journey. At Antioch he had been among brethren. In Cyprus he had been in the neighborhood of the ancestral

estates. At Perga, however, he was facing toward peoples and lands which were altogether strange. He had made some inquiries about the docks and in the taverns, and a number of people had told him that the very road upon which Barnabas and Paul were now thinking of traveling was infested with brigands and they would be in peril of robbers all the way. He did not know that Paul would be stoned and left for dead on this journey, but he knew that any one of them might have such an experience almost any day. He had been coddled more or less all his life, and this seemed altogether too dangerous to him. His mother would be worried about him, he was sure. It would be well for him to go back and assure her that he was safe. She would not want him to run into any unnecessary perils or to take any unnecessary risks. "Do not be afraid," said Barnabas. "Stand fast in the faith, quit you like a man, be strong," said Paul. "No," said Mark. "If you older men should die, you would not lose much; but I have all of life before me. I do not care to die just yet."

(3) There may have been another reason why Mark was disaffected at just this point in this journey. When they had left Antioch his relative Barnabas was the leader of the expedition. The Holy Spirit had said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for this work." [21] Sergius Paulus had summoned Barnabas and Saul to hear from them the word of God.[22] The name of Barnabas comes first in these passages. He evidently was the recognized head of the company, as the older and wealthier and better known and more influential man of the two. Yet even upon Cyprus Paul seems to have been the more prominent of the two workers, and when they leave Cyprus the record reads, "Now Paul and his company set sail." [23] Henceforth Barnabas holds the subordinate position, and Paul becomes the outstanding

[21] Acts 13. 2.
[22] Acts 13. 7.
[23] Acts 13. 13.

figure in all the missionary history. Mark may have been disgruntled at this unexpected deposing of his cousin and promoting of the younger and less sympathetic man, Paul. We take it that Barnabas with his generous heart would yield gracefully to the trend of affairs and would be altogether willing that Paul should increase while he should decrease, if the mission only prospered more largely in Paul's hands; but Mark was a younger man and more hot-headed and impulsive.

He probably argued the case out with Barnabas himself: "Were you not a Christian long before this man Paul ever came into the church? Did you not introduce him at Jerusalem and become sponsor for him in the beginning? Does he not owe all his standing among the brethren in the first instance to you? Did you not recall him from Tarsus to Antioch and make him your associate in the flourishing work there? Have you not been his backer in all his career? Does he not owe all his present reputation to you? Did not the church at Antioch expect you to be the leader in this expedition, even as you had been the leader in their church at home? Why do you tamely permit him to take the reins in his hands? Did you not ask me to accompany you with the understanding that you were to direct affairs? Am I under any obligation to follow any leadership but yours? I thought we two would decide matters to suit ourselves; but if Paul is going to decide where we go and how long we stay, and we are simply to tag along wherever he says, and if this is going to be 'Paul and his company' after this, I get off at this station. I sail for home from this port. This is more than I bargained for, and I quit right here." Barnabas doubtless reasoned with him, but to no avail. Paul may have suspected that there was some family jealousy partly responsible for Mark's decision to depart from them and return to Jerusalem, and it did not appeal to him as a good reason for quitting a missionary enterprise. He called it apostasy, and he resented it deeply.

(4) Still another and fourth reason may have entered into the final conclusion of Mark at this time. He may have been surprised at the tone of Paul's preaching. It was a more liberal type of preaching than that to which he had been accustomed in Jerusalem. Mark was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and at Jerusalem all of the Christians were Jews, and they were very conscientious and very scrupulous in the observance of all the regulations of the Jewish law. They preached the necessity of these things even as they preached the necessity of faith in Jesus the Christ. Paul was not insisting upon these things. He was permitting Gentiles to come into the Christian Church without becoming Jews. He did not seem to have the respect for the Jewish customs which they had at Jerusalem. He was letting down the barriers on every side.

Mark never had come into contact with such looseness in procedure. He was shocked by it. He protested to Barnabas: "You ought not to allow it. What authority has Paul for such preaching? Do any of the other apostles preach like that? Have not all the leaders of the church in Jerusalem insisted upon these things which he rules out? Did not the Master observe all of these things? Did he not say that he had not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil them all? Who is this Paul, then, that he should set up his dictum against that of the Master and of all the disciples of the Master and against the authority of Moses and of all the holy prophets of old? I tell you this is an innovation which they do not know about in the mother church in Jerusalem; for if they knew it, they would put a stop to it right away—you may depend upon that. I tell you that this is a liberalism which is most destructive in its tendencies. No one can tell what the outcome of such preaching will be. If the Gentiles accept it in large numbers, it may be that the heritage will be wrested away from God's chosen people and all the promises of the prophets will be set at naught for centuries to come. I tell you if

this is to be the style of preaching on this mission journey, I will have nothing more to do with it. I wash my hands of the whole business. I am going back to Jerusalem to tell the folks there all about it."

Barnabas was troubled in his own mind about these things. He knew well enough that the Jewish brethren had one opinion on this subject, and that Paul had another. He knew that what Mark said was true, and that they would lay down the law to him when he got home again. He was not quite clear about this issue. What Paul said seemed plausible, and it did seem that the success of the work among the Gentiles depended upon the Pauline style of preaching. He was willing to let things slide for the present. As long as matters were progressing prosperously why stir up any trouble? What need was there for any rupture at the present time? Mark was a younger man and more thoroughgoing in his theology. He thought this was no time for complaisance and compromise. Paul might call him an apostate for leaving the missionary expedition at this point, if he cared to. Mark would go to Jerusalem and tell them that Paul was an apostate from the true faith.

We have known some instances in our own generation where a young man felt called upon to purge a whole church of heresy and made a deal of trouble for himself and for others by bringing charges against the foremost thinkers and leaders of his day only to find himself universally discredited at last and to awaken to the perception that these older and better and wiser men were in possession of a higher truth than he had yet apprehended. Mark was just such a young man. It is a common experience for some young men in the early stage of their development to run amuck with the highest forces of their age, to attempt to stem the tide against the deeper currents of Divine Providence, to fight with all sincerity against the stars in their courses. Happy is that young man who graduates early out of this mock-heroic stage of his existence and has his eyes

opened to see things as they are and to repent in time his futile endeavor to defeat the purposes of God.

We take it that Mark went back to Jerusalem and stirred up a lot of trouble there. He may have come down to Antioch later with certain other brethren from James and have helped to make the trouble for Peter and Barnabas and Paul which is recorded in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. Later, however, he must have seen the error of his ways. Like the church at large, he was convinced by the logic of events, and, when convinced and repentant, Paul used him again in the ministry.

Now, if we are right in analyzing the state of Mark's mind at this time and in concluding that he left Barnabas and Paul partly because he was homesick, and partly because he was cowardly, and partly because he was jealous, and partly because he was suspicious of the Pauline preaching and theology, we can readily understand how Barnabas as the young man's relative might have been disposed to be lenient toward his faults and half-sympathetic with his opinions, while Paul, on the contrary, would have seen no sufficient reason for his fickleness of conduct or instability of character. We are not surprised, therefore, that when Barnabas proposed that John Mark should accompany them on a second missionary journey, Paul made strenuous objection.

Paul wrote afterward to the Corinthians that Christian love, *οὐ παροξύνεται*, never has a paroxysm,[24] but Luke tells us in the book of Acts that there was a paroxysm, *ἐγένετο δὲ παροξυσμός*, over this question of the choice of Mark as an attendant, and it became so pronounced that Barnabas and Paul separated at this time.[25] Somebody must have lost his experience of perfect love for the moment at least. We think that it was Barnabas, and not Paul, for we are disposed to sympathize with Paul in his position at this

[24] 1 Cor. 13. 5.
[25] Acts 15. 39.

crisis. We think that Paul was justified in concluding that Mark had shown that he was incapable of heroic enterprise. He would not endure hardship like a good soldier. He was likely to fail in an emergency. He could not be trusted in such serious undertaking as they then proposed. He was governed by impulses rather than by principle. He was quick to advance and just as quick to lose heart and run away.

It is Paul's attitude at this time which leads us to conclude that the excuses sometimes offered for Mark in this juncture are not justified by the facts of the case. It has been suggested that the Holy Spirit had set Barnabas and Saul aside for this undertaking, but no such divine constraint had been put upon Mark, and he therefore felt free to abandon the enterprise at any time. We are told that he may not have contemplated so long a journey when they set out and so long an absence from home; and when the invasion of Asia Minor was determined upon he felt that circumstances demanded his return. He had not agreed to go any farther, and he was sure that his duty led him back to Jerusalem rather than on any longer tour. His mother's health may have failed or circumstances may have compelled his immediate attention at home. He may have been summoned by courier and thus have been obliged to break company with the apostles at this time.

These things are possibilities; but if there had been actual mitigating considerations, Paul would have given them due weight. The fact that he seems to have seen no good excuse for Mark's desertion at this point leads us to conclude that it was not for any good or sufficient reason, but, rather, for some one or for all of the reasons we have suggested above. Whatever the reasons were, they seemed to Paul to be derogatory to Mark's character. We are disposed to think that Paul was right in this conclusion.

If Paul read Mark's character correctly, Mark must have been vacillating and uncertain in early life. Such a character

is not very useful for the time being; but the one good thing about it is that it can develop. The New Testament record would lead us to believe that the unpromising beginning of Mark's missionary and ministerial career was forgotten and forgiven in the honorable record of his later life. Barnabas and Peter both came to believe that Paul was right where they had been wrong, and Mark probably was convinced in their convincing. He never became a leading character, but he did become a faithful servant. He attended upon Barnabas and upon Peter and finally upon Paul himself, and he was a help and a comfort to all of them. In the New Testament record he never assumes any large spiritual responsibilities. He always occupied a subordinate position. He may have been a business manager for the apostles or a teacher and catechist for their converts, and in this way he was prepared to found the first theological school in the Christian church in the later days. He grew in grace and enjoyed the increasing respect of his Christian brethren. In his old age, according to church tradition, he came to represent something of the authority of the great apostles who had died. We turn to these traditions for some other facts and suggestions concerning him.

4. *Traditions Concerning Him.* We are not sure that Mark had any personal connection with the Lord's ministry. Some have desired to establish such a connection, since he is one of the four evangelists, but they have not been able to adduce very good ground for such a conclusion. Yet it is possible, and we are disposed to favor the supposition.

(1) A writer in the early part of the fourth century, in the Dialogue of Adamantius with the Marcionite, tells us that Mark was one of the seventy-two disciples sent out by the Master to prepare the way for his own coming.[26]

(2) Toward the close of the fourth century Epiphanius bears witness to the same fact and then adds that Mark was one of the disciples who went back and walked no more with

[26] Luke 10. 1.

the Lord, after the hard sayings in the synagogue in Capernaum.[27] It is more than probable that Mark's apostasy at Perga is responsible for the tradition that he had been a backslider once before, and that he had deserted the Master even as he later deserted the apostle Paul. We trust for Mark's sake that this tradition is not true.

(3) Alexander in the sixth century says that the aged had told him that Mark was the man bearing the pitcher of water who led the two disciples to the room prepared for the eating of the passover.[28] This tradition probably was attached to the still earlier one in the sixth century recorded by Theodosius, who said that the house of Mark the evangelist was the one in which the Lord ate the Last Supper with his disciples, and the one in which the disciples were gathered together after the resurrection when they received the baptism of Pentecost. It is, of course, a possibility that the home of Mary the mother of Mark had in it a large upper room which she placed at the disposal of the Master and of his disciples during those last days of his ministry, and that the Last Supper was eaten there, and that the disciples were assembled there when the Lord appeared to them on the evening of the first Easter day and on the Sunday following, and that they met there from day to day to wait for the promised blessing of Pentecost, and that it was a hallowed meeting place for praise and prayer thereafter for the Jerusalem church. It was to that room that Peter made his way when released from prison, and there he found the assembly engaged in prayer in his behalf. It may be that all these great events in the history of the church took place inside one building and in one upper room. However, we might have expected the New Testament writers to make some mention of that fact, if it were one; and in their silence we cannot be sure of it on merely sixth-century authority.

[27] John 6. 66. Haer., li, 6.

[28] Mark 14. 13.

(4) It has been suggested by still later writers that Mark was the young man who followed with Jesus, after the seizure in the garden of Gethsemane, of whom we read that he had only a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body: and that when they laid hold upon him he left the linen cloth and fled naked.[29] Mark is the only one who records this rather trivial incident, and no very good reason can be assigned for his introducing it into his brief narrative, unless it may be that he had some personal interest in it. If he himself were this young man, he might have inserted the story as a kind of personal autograph, as much as to say: "I know something about these things from personal experience. At this point I myself enter into touch with them." This again is not impossible, and we may even grant that it is probable to some extent.

Lange, Olshausen, Thomson, Luckock, and others are ready to identify this young man with Mark. Zahn says: "He paints a small picture of himself in the corner of his work which contains so many figures. What he narrates of himself is no heroic deed, but only a thoughtless action of his youth." [30] Mark had gone to bed in his own home on that night of the Last Supper, and when Jesus and the disciples left the house he was moved by curiosity or anxiety to follow them, and without waiting to dress he had thrown this linen cloth about him and had crept forth to see what was to happen. It was a night of great adventure for the boy, and with the boy's facility for being on hand when any excitement occurred he saw the arrest of Jesus and was so near the soldiers that one of them snatched at him and was left with the linen cloth in his hand while the lad scurried away. It was not a very important matter to anyone except himself. In later years he may have taken the opportunity of chronicling it, to show that he had a small part in the great events of that night.

[29] Mark 14. 51, 52.

[30] Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii, p. 494.

(5) We learn from Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Nicephorus, and others that Peter sent Mark as his substitute from Rome to Egypt and that Mark founded the catechetical school at Alexandria in Egypt[31] which may claim to be the first theological school of the Christian church and which had a most notable succession of masters in Pantænus, Clement, Origen, and Dionysius; and Athanasius came later. Mark became the first bishop of the church in Alexandria and he was martyred there at the feast of Serapis, A. D. 68. W. F. Warren thus describes the martyrdom: "On the feast day of Serapis, tutelar deity of Alexandria, the holy evangelist, then laboring in that city, fell into the hands of the maddened heathen. They tied his feet to a chariot, and dragged him through the streets and down to the seashore, dragged him the livelong day over hot sands and stony banks, everywhere marking their track with shreds of flesh and a lengthening trail of blood. Exhausted at last, and marvelling that their victim died not, they cast him into a dungeon for the night. On the next morning they found him wondrously refreshed and quickened by two visions of glory, which had been vouchsafed to him during the darkness. Again they bound him to the chariot, and dragged his mangled form till God in mercy granted him in death a happy deliverance. History tells us that a little more than three centuries from that day the colossal image of Serapis was dragged, mutilated and dishonored, through those same streets of Alexandria, and Mark proclaimed the patron saint of the city. The proud temple of the idol—one of the grandest in the whole world —was demolished while fanes sacred to Mark began to rise throughout the earth." [32]

If Mark died such a martyr death, he surely made sufficient atonement for all the weakness of his early youth.

[31] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., ii, 16. Epiphanius, Haer., li, 6. Jerome, De vir. illus., 8. Nicephorus, Hist. Eccles., ii, 42.

[32] Compare Nicephorus, Hist. Eccl., ii, 43.

He had attained unto the heroic mold at last. He was a worthy successor to Peter and Paul, as they had worthily succeeded their martyred Lord.

(6) Early in the ninth century Mark's body is said to have been removed from Egypt to Venice. On the Piazza of Saint Mark the Venetians built a stately five-domed cathedral. They called it the Cathedral of Saint Mark and there his bones are interred, and he is the patron saint of the city of Venice to this day.

Ruskin thus describes the interior of Saint Mark's in Venice: "It is lost in still deeper twilight, to which the eye must become accustomed for some moments before the form of the building can be traced; and then there opens before us a vast cave, hewn out into the form of a cross, and divided into shadowy aisles by many pillars. Round the domes of its roof the light enters only through narrow apertures like large stars; and here and there a ray or two from some far-away casement wanders into the darkness, and casts a narrow phosphoric stream upon the waves of marble that heave and fall in a thousand colors along the floor. What else there is of light, is from torches, or silver lamps, burning ceaselessly in the recesses of the chapels; the roof sheeted with gold, and the polished walls covered with alabaster, give back, at every curve and angle, some feeble gleaming to the flames; and the glories round the heads of the sculptured saints flash out upon us as we pass them, and sink again into the gloom.

"Under foot and overhead, a continual succession of crowded imagery, one picture passing into another, as in a dream; the passions and pleasures of human life symbolized together, and the mystery of its redemption; for the mazes of interwoven lines and changeful pictures lead always at last to the cross, lifted and carved in every place and upon every stone; sometimes with the serpent of eternity wrapt round it, sometimes with doves beneath its arms, and sweet herbage growing forth from its feet; but con-

spicuous most of all on the great rood that crosses the church before the altar, raised in bright blazonry against the shadow of the apse. . . . It is the cross that is first seen, and always, burning in the center of the temple; and every dome and hollow of its roof has the figure of Christ in the utmost height of it, raised in power, or returning in judgment. . . .

"Darkness and mystery; confused recesses of building; artificial light employed in small quantity, but maintained with a constancy which seems to give it a kind of sacredness; preciousness of material easily comprehended by the vulgar eye; close air loaded with a sweet and peculiar odor associated only with religious services; solemn music, and tangible idols or images having popular legends attached to them—these are assembled in Saint Mark's to a degree, as far as I know, unexampled in any other European church. . . .

"Nor is this interior without effect on the minds of the people. At every hour of the day there are groups collected before the various shrines, and solitary worshipers scattered through the darker places of the church, evidently in prayer both deep and reverent, and, for the most part, profoundly sorrowful. The devotees at the greater number of the renowned shrines of Romanism may be seen murmuring their appointed prayers with wandering eyes and unengaged gestures; but the step of the stranger does not disturb those who kneel on the pavement of Saint Mark's; and hardly a moment passes, from early morning to sunset, in which we may not see some half-veiled figure enter beneath the Arabian porch, cast itself into long abasement on the floor of the temple, and then rising slowly with more confirmed step, and with a passionate kiss and clasp of the arms given to the feet of the crucifix, by which the lamps burn always in the northern aisle, leave the church, as if comforted." [33]

---

[33] Stones of Venice, II, iv, pp. 18, 19, 20.

The Cathedral of Saint Mark's is a worthy monument to the evangelist. The Venetians consider the lion to be Mark's symbol, and it may have been an appropriate symbol for his later life. He died, one of the heroes of the faith; but the Mark of the New Testament books was first of all a calf and then an ox in patient ministry; and we think that the ox is the most appropriate symbol for the Gospel he has written. Matthew pictured Jesus as the Lion of Judah and the King of Israel; Mark pictures him rather as the ox treading the furrow of his appointed task, the Servant of all, busied in ceaseless ministry.

We now have followed Mark from his callow youth to his mellow old age, and we have found his character changing for the better all along the line. He was hot-hearted and wrong-headed in the beginning, but his conduct cooled down and his creed cleared up in time. It is to Mark's credit that he could work at last in harmony with such opposite characters as Peter and Paul. It is to his credit that he gave a lifetime of effort to the furtherance of the Christian cause. It is to his everlasting credit that he wrote the earliest and most authentic narrative of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is to the traditions concerning the writing of that Gospel that we turn next.

II. Traditions as to the Writing of the Gospel

1. Papias was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the first half of the second century. Eusebius in his Church History has quoted the tradition which Papias gives in regard to Mark, the author of the Gospel, in the following words; "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not indeed in order, whatsoever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterward, as I said, he followed Peter, who adapted his teaching to the needs of his hearers, but with no intention of giving a con-

nected account of the Lord's discourses, so that Mark committed no error while he thus wrote some things as he remembered them. For he was careful of one thing, not to omit any of the things which he had heard, and not to state any of them falsely." [34] This is the earliest statement in church literature concerning the writing of our second Gospel. There are three things to be noted in it: first, that Mark was not an eyewitness of these things which he records; second, that he simply reports the preaching of Peter concerning them; and, third, that Papias has all confidence in the accuracy of the report. Of these three facts the most important is that the authority of Peter is placed behind the narrative of the second Gospel. This seems to have been the universal belief in the early church.

2. Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century, quotes the statement found only in Mark 3. 17 as from "Peter's Memoirs." [35] If this name is rightly given to the second Gospel, it ought to be called "The Gospel according to Peter as recorded by Mark." Mark is only the scribe, and Peter is the responsible authority. This was the conclusion of Tertullian, as we shall see later, and it is represented among modern writers by Paul Ewald, who thinks that Mark's contribution was confined to arrangement of the material and nothing more, and who says that a modern writer would have formulated the title somewhat as follows, "Favorite reminiscences of Peter's, from the time when he himself companied with Jesus in Galilee and on the way to Jerusalem, put together in some scenes and edited by Mark." [36] On the other hand, that the early church believed that Mark was the responsible author of the book is evidenced by the superscription given it in all our codices. It never is Κατὰ Πέτρον, "according to Peter," but always Κατὰ Μάρκον, "according to Mark." Peter may be the

[34] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., iii, 39.
[35] Dial. 106.
[36] Ewald, Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage, p. 26.

"literary grandfather" [37] of the second Gospel, but he is not the father nor direct literary author of it. That responsibility belongs to Mark.

3. Clement of Alexandria, at the end of the second century, as reported by Eusebius in his Church History, says: "The Gospel according to Mark had this occasion. As Peter had preached the word publicly at Rome, and declared the gospel by the Spirit, many who were present requested that Mark, who had followed him for a long time and remembered his sayings, should write them out. And having composed the Gospel, he gave it to those who had requested it. When Peter learned of this, he neither directly forbade nor encouraged it." [38] It would seem from this account that the second Gospel was written at Rome, and that its composition was begun, if not finished, during Peter's life and ministry there.

4. Irenæus of Gaul, writing about the same date, says that Matthew wrote his Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundations of the Church; and then he adds, "After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter." [39] Irenæus agrees with the other church Fathers in making the Gospel the record of the preaching of Peter, but he differs with Clement in placing the composition of the Gospel after Peter's death, if by the apostles' departure he means their death.

5. Tertullian says that the Gospel "which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was." [40]

6. Origen, as reported by Eusebius, says, "I have learned

---

[37] Morison, Commentary, p. xxviii.
[38] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, vi, 14.
[39] Adv. Haer., iii, 1.
[40] Adv. Marc., iv. 5.

by tradition that the second Gospel is by Mark, who composed it according to the instructions of Peter, who in his catholic epistle acknowledges him as a son." [41]

7. Eusebius on his own account declares: "So greatly did the splendor of piety illumine the minds of Peter's hearers that they were not satisfied with hearing once only, and were not content with the unwritten teaching of the divine gospel, but with all sorts of entreaties they besought Mark, a follower of Peter, and the one whose Gospel is extant, that he would leave them a written monument of the doctrine which had been orally communicated to them. Nor did they cease until they had prevailed with the man, and had thus become the occasion of the written Gospel which bears the name of Mark. And they say that Peter, when he had learned, through a revelation of the Spirit, of that which had been done, was pleased with the zeal of the men, and that the work obtained the sanction of his authority for the purpose of being used in the churches." [42]

All of these early authorities agree that Mark simply represents Peter in his writing. The Christian Church has held very generally to this opinion. In Christian art, represented by such paintings as those of Angelico da Fiesole in the Gallery of Florence and of Bellini in the Academy of Venice and of Bonvicino in the Brera at Milan, Mark is the scribe taking notes while Peter is preaching in the public assembly or writing to Peter's dictation in the seclusion of some private room. The impression made by the book as we read it to-day corresponds to the facts handed down by tradition; for, as Archdeacon Allen says: "Mark, with its incompleteness, its presupposition of knowledge on the part of its readers, its unevenness, its want of historical setting, is unique in literature. It is not a history, not a biography, not a memoir. It is intended not to inform, but to remind.

---

[41] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, vi, 25.
[42] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, ii, 15.

Those who read it will read what they have heard before."[43] We can easily believe that the first readers of this book would be reminded of Peter at every turn.

There seems to be some difference of opinion among the church Fathers, however, as to the time of Mark's writing, whether it took place during Peter's lifetime or after his death. It may be that the explanation of this difference lies in the fact that Mark began his work while Peter was living and that Peter gave his sanction to the notes which Mark had then made, but that the Gospel in its present form was published only after Peter's death. If this be true, it would be difficult to give an exact date for the composition or the publication of the Gospel. It is possible that Mark himself would have been puzzled to do it. Some time between A. D. 60 and 70 it is possible that the work was begun and revised and completed. The more exact determination of the date would depend somewhat upon the relation believed to exist between the second Gospel and the other synoptics. If Mark is dependent upon them, it must be assigned to a later date. If they are dependent upon Mark, its date must, of course, be earlier than these.

8. Augustine[44] takes the position that the Gospel according to Mark is simply an epitome or summary of the Gospel according to Matthew. Augustine's great influence in the church led to the general adoption of this opinion that Mark simply had abbreviated the contents of Matthew, and consequently Mark was held in comparatively light esteem for many centuries. Speaking of Augustine's dictum, Maclean says: "Seldom has one short sentence had such an unfortunate effect in distorting a judgment on a literary work; and largely in consequence of it Mark has been generally neglected. The second Gospel seems hardly to have engaged the attention of commentators; and the writer known as Victor of Antioch, in the fifth century or later,

[43] Expository Times, vol. xi, p. 425.

[44] De Consensu Evangelistorum, i, 3.

says that he has not been able to find a single author who had expounded it." [45]

Maclean begins his discussion of the Gospel with the sentence, "No book of the New Testament has experienced such a change in public estimation as the second Gospel." That means that the opinion of Augustine has been reversed at last, and that the Gospel according to Mark has come to the place of first honor among the Gospels as the earliest and most authentic of them all. Augustine's opinion has been represented among more modern scholars by Griesbach, Fritzsche, Bleek, Baur, De Wette, Delitzsch, Köstlin, Kahnis, and others. The present tendency, however, is toward the recognition of the independence and the priority of Mark. The following authorities may be quoted as representatives of this view: Bruno Bauer, Ewald, Gould, Hitzig, Holtzmann, Lachmann, Maclean, Meyer, Reuss, Salmon, Salmond, Schenkel, Scholten, Storr, Ritschl, Thiersch, Volkmar, Weiss, Weisse, Weizsäcker, Wilke, Wright.[46] These men stand for very different schools of thought; but they all agree that in the second Gospel we have the primitive account of the life and labors of the Lord. We are ready to agree with them, and to conclude that this Gospel was written at Rome, as Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius have testified; and at some time between 60 and 70 A. D. Archdeacon Allen is ready to say, "I think it probable that critical opinion will shortly move in the direction of, say, 50 A. D., or shortly before, for the publication of a Greek Second Gospel." [47]

[45] Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, vol. ii, p. 122.

[46] Wright says, "Saint Mark's is the archaic Gospel. . . . It is simple where the others are complex; it is meager where they are rich; it is a chronicle while they are histories; it contains Latin and Aramaic words which they have translated or removed. . . . Augustine, therefore, is wrong in every particular."—Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, vol. ii, p. 85.

[47] Expository Times, vol. xxi, p. 444.

III. Characterizations of the Gospel

1. This is *The Gospel for the Latin Peoples.*

If we are correct in following the church tradition as to the place of writing, it would seem to follow as a matter of course that a Gospel written at Rome would have especial reference to the circumstances and the needs of the people in that city and of that race. The internal evidence points in the same direction. The Gospel according to Matthew evidently was prepared especially for the Jews. That this is not true of the Gospel according to Mark seems clear for the following reasons:

(1) Mark omits all Hebrew genealogies. They would not be of interest to the Romans as they were to the Jews. Mark has nothing to say about the birth or the parentage of Jesus. He does not mention Joseph anywhere, and Mary's name occurs only once, in the question, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" [48]

(2) There is no insistence upon the binding obligation of the Jewish law in this Gospel. The word "law" does not occur in the whole Gospel. It is found in Matthew eight times, and in Luke nine times, and in John fifteen times. It is a strange fact that Mark never uses the word.

(3) There are fewer references to the Old Testament in the second Gospel than in any of the other three. Only one such reference is peculiar to Mark, the one with which he begins; and that, according to our text, is wrongly ascribed to Isaiah. It is really from Mal. 3. 1, and Mark inserts it before the quotation from Isa. 40. 3, which is found in the other Synoptics. It is the only passage in which Mark quotes an author by name, and in this single venture into the Old Testament field on his own account he makes a mistake in the name.

(4) Mark translates certain Aramaic words which he has preserved in his Gospel, as if he were sure that those

[48] Mark 6. 3.

for whom he was writing would not understand them; such as "Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder,"[49] and "Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise;"[50] and "Corban, that is to say, Given;"[51] and "Ephphatha, that is, Be opened;"[52] and "The son of Timæus, Bartimæus;"[53] and "Abba, Father;"[54] and "Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull;"[55] and "Eloi, Eloi, lama, sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[56]

(5) In the same way Mark explains Jewish customs as he would not think of doing if, like Matthew, he had been writing to Jews; as, for example, in the parenthesis found in 7. 3, 4, "The Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the market place, except they wash themselves, they eat not; and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, washings of cups, and pots, and brasen vessels." Again, in 12. 18 Mark explains the creed of the Sadducees, and in 2. 18, he says that the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast, and in 14. 12 and 15. 6, 42 Mark adds such explanations of the passover observances as he thinks those who were not Jews might need. He thinks it necessary to say that the Jordan is the river of Jordan[57] and that the Mount of Olives is over against the temple.[58]

Evidently, he is not writing to Jews. Is there anything which will help us to determine more explicitly for whom Mark has composed this Gospel? We think that we can add to the negative considerations which we have now adduced several positive indications which point directly toward Rome.

---

[49] Mark 3. 17.
[50] Mark 5. 41.
[51] Mark 7. 11.
[52] Mark 7. 34.
[53] Mark 10. 46.
[54] Mark 14. 36.
[55] Mark 15. 22.
[56] Mark 15. 34.
[57] Mark 1. 5.
[58] Mark 13. 3.

(6) Mark's name is in itself a suggestion of Roman associations. We already have seen that his original name was the Hebrew name "John," and that this name fell into disuse in the Christian Church and was replaced by the Roman name "Marcus." It may have been that this Roman name took the place of his Hebrew name because he himself had ceased to be associated in thought with Jerusalem and had come to be identified with Rome.

(7) There is a curious collocation of names in Mark 15. 21. There we are told that Simon of Cyrene, who was compelled to bear the cross to Golgotha, was "the father of Alexander and Rufus." Godet says: "This indication evidently presupposes that the two sons of Simon were persons well known to, and of consideration in, the church for which the author was writing; there is no similar instance in the other Gospels. If, then, we can ascertain where these men lived, we shall know the place from which the author wrote. The Epistle to the Romans here comes to our aid. 'Salute,' says Paul to the church in Rome, 'Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine,' Rom. 16. 13. The family of Simon had therefore migrated to Rome. Paul, who had known them in the East, sends his greeting to them in that city. And the author of our second Gospel, having the surviving members of the family before his eyes at the time he was writing, felt constrained to do honor to the unique part which its head had played in the drama of the cross. These indications seem to me clear enough." [59] Rufus is mentioned in the New Testament in these two passages alone. Simon is said to be the father of Rufus, and we learn that a Rufus was a prominent member of the church at Rome. If we identify these two Rufuses as one and the same man, we can readily see how Mark, writing for the Roman church, would mention the relationship between Simon and Rufus, an item of

[59] New Testament Studies, p. 29.

information which would be of interest to that church especially, if not to that church alone.

(8) There are more Latinisms in this Gospel than in any other book of the New Testament. There are some found in Mark which occur in one or more of the other Gospels, such as *modius,* 4. 21; *legio,* 5. 9, 15; *denarius,* 6. 37; 12. 15; 14. 5; *census,* 12. 14; *quadrans,* 12. 42; *flagello,* 15. 15; and *prætorium,* 15. 16. Some others are found in Mark alone, such as *speculator,* 6. 27; *sextarius,* 7. 4, 8; and *centurio,* 15. 39, 44, 45. This makes a list of ten words of Latin origin found in this short book. There are some distinctive Latin idioms in the Gospel, such as "to give counsel," *consilium dare,* and "to be in the last extremity," *in extremis esse.*[60] Mark translates his account into Roman expressions more than once, as when he says that the poor widow cast in two mites which make (in the Roman coinage) a quadrans, 12. 42; or, again, when he tells us that the soldiers led Jesus away within the court, which is (called by you Romans) the Prætorium, 15. 16.

All of these things are indications that Mark was writing in a Roman environment, and if they are not in themselves sufficient to prove that fact, they are sufficient to confirm and establish the unanimous tradition of the early church to that effect. We find that the Gospel itself bears witness to the same truth which the church Fathers had stated, namely, that the Gospel according to Mark is a Gospel written especially for the Latin race. As such, it makes its appeal to those elements in the life of Jesus which would be most attractive to the practical Roman mind. Riggenbach has noticed one illustration of this truth when he said, "As the interpreter of the Apostle of action, Mark describes the Son of God in the power of His actions to the Romans who are the people of action."[61] We turn next to some of the proofs of this statement.

[60] Credner, Einleitung, p. 104.

[61] Leben Jesu, ii. 50.

2. This is *The Gospel of the Strenuous Life.*

This Gospel pictures Jesus as the tireless worker through days of almost incredible toil. Mark alone has recorded the fact that twice in his ministry neither Jesus nor those who were working with him had even time to eat.[62] Something is happening all the time in this narrative. Mark helps us to see that Jesus was doing things as well as saying things. He is a doer of deeds as well as a teacher of truth. The first Gospel is filled with discourses, the second Gospel is filled with strenuous performances. The Gospel of instruction is followed by the Gospel of action. The Gospel according to Matthew was filled with parables and preaching; the Gospel according to Mark is filled with miracles and active ministry. Farrar says: "Swift and incisive, Mark's narrative proceeds straight to the goal like a Roman soldier on his march to battle. In reading this Gospel, carried away by the breathless narrative, we feel like the apostles who among the press of the people coming and going had no leisure so much as to eat. Event after event comes upon us in his pages with the impetuous sequence of the waves in a rising tide." [63]

The Gospel has no introduction, beyond the mere phrase, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Then straightway Mark hastens into the midst of things, *festinat in medias res,* as Horace says of Homer. The Gospel has no conclusion, in the text which has been preserved to our day. It breaks off as abruptly as it began, at the close of 16. 8. Some one else has written a conclusion and appended it to the narrative of Mark at that point. The story is a hurried one throughout. It is like the typical romance in a modern story paper in that respect. There is something new and startling in every chapter and almost in every paragraph, and at the most exciting point the narrative abruptly stops, and we look for the familiar legend "To

[62] Mark 3. 20; 6. 31.

[63] Messages of the Books, p. 59.

be continued in our next." Archbishop Thomson says that in this Gospel "the wonder-working Son of God sweeps over his kingdom swiftly and meteorlike." [64]

The characteristic word in this Gospel is the Greek word *εὐθύς*, "straightway." Twice in the Gospel it is repeated three times in three consecutive verses. It occurs forty-two times in Mark, only seven times in the much longer Gospel according to Matthew, only three times in John, and only once in the Gospel according to Luke, and only once in the book of Acts. Dr. DaCosta compared this Gospel to Cæsar's Commentaries and Mark's *εὐθύς* to Cæsar's *celeriter*. The Authorized Version used seven words to translate Mark's one word *εὐθύς* in different passages, "immediately, anon, forthwith, by and by, as soon as, straightway, shortly." The Revised Version has rightly used one word throughout.[65]

This narrative is like a panorama in rapid motion. We see one picture and straightway another takes its place, and then another and another, until we might think that the Master's life was filled with ceaseless and incredible activity. It is the Gospel of the strenuous life. It deals with only the most active portion of the Lord's ministry and with the crowded events of the closing week. It could be summarized in the two words used by Peter in his sermon to Cornelius and his household, when he said concerning Jesus, *διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν*; and we might paraphrase those two words as follows, "He went through his whole life, straight as an arrow to its mark, with astonishing rapidity, scattering the largess of his good deeds with lavish hand and with ceaseless activity and with boundless benevolence all along the way. He went through the land and he went through life, doing good all the time." [66]

---

[64] Speaker's Commentary, vol. i, p. xxxv.

[65] Notice its recurrence eleven times in the first chapter: i. 10, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 30, 42, 43.

[66] Acts 10. 38.

However, Mark would not have us believe that the Master had no need of rest and recuperation in the swirl of his ministerial activity. Mark emphasizes that need more fully than any other of the evangelists.

3. This is *The Gospel of Repeated Retirements from active and public life.*

"It is an interesting feature to which Dr. Lange first has directed attention, that Mark lays emphasis on the periods of pause and rest which rhythmically intervene between the several great victories achieved by Christ. He came out from his obscure abode in Nazareth; each fresh advance in his public life is preceded by a retirement, and each retirement is followed by a new and greater victory. The contrast between the contemplative rest and the vigorous action is striking and explains the overpowering effect by revealing its secret spring in the communion with God and with himself. Thus we have after his baptism a retirement to the wilderness in Judæa before he preached in Galilee, 1. 12; a retirement to the ship, 3. 7; to the desert on the eastern shore of the lake of Galilee, 6. 31; to a mountain, 6. 46; to the border land of Tyre and Sidon, 7. 24; to Decapolis, 7. 31; to a high mountain, 9. 2; to Bethany, 11. 1; to Gethsemane, 14. 34; his rest in the grave before the resurrection, and his withdrawal from the world and his reappearance in the victories of the gospel preached by his disciples. The ascension of the Lord forms his last withdrawal, which is to be followed by his final onset and absolute victory." [67]

If Mark shows Jesus living the strenuous life to the last degree, he shows him sensible enough to take frequent respites or vacations. Jesus fled publicity. He feared the overstrain. The healing ministry taxed his strength. Virtue went out of him in his constant contact with the sick and the suffering; and after a steady siege of it for hours and days he was physically weakened and mentally barren and spiritually exhausted. Constant association with

[67] Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. i, p. 635.

the sick and the constant sight of the deformed and the mutilated told upon his nervous system at last. The teaching ministry was only less taxing than the other. Heart and brain were wholly engaged in the work, and he came again and again to the verge of nervous collapse. He was so weary sometimes that in the very first moment of quiet he had he fell into the very depths of sleep, and he slept so soundly that the tempest's fury did not waken him. He was so weary sometimes that he fled secretly to escape the further strain. When all the city was gathered at his door at sunset, he got up the next morning before sunrise and departed into a desert place.[68] When the cities were making him notorious he remained "without in desert places."[69] He liked to be alone some of the time. He liked to take his disciples apart by themselves.[70] When the people sought him most, he sought solitude most earnestly.

Is this the Gospel of the strenuous life? It is; and nevertheless in this Gospel Jesus seems almost constantly to be getting away, withdrawing to desert places, to Tyre and Sidon, to Cæsarea Philippi, to Bethany, to heaven. He longs to go apart with his disciples and with his God. He retires sometimes to escape from his foes.[71] He retires sometimes to escape from his friends.[72] He retires sometimes to escape to his God, to refresh his soul in prayer and communion with the Father before attempting any further work.[73] He constantly was recruiting his exhausted powers. He constantly was guarding against danger from enemies and from overwork. His strenuous life was made possible by his frequent withdrawals for recuperation and rest. It was after these withdrawals that he was most efficient again.

---

[68] Mark 1. 35.
[69] Mark 1. 45.
[70] Mark 6. 31; 9. 2.
[71] Mark 6. 6; 6. 30; 7. 24; 11. 19.
[72] Mark 1. 35; 11. 11.
[73] Mark 1. 35.

Each retirement only made ready for renewed wonders of healing and teaching power.

Does Mark crowd these wonders upon us, and fill his pages with them? He does; and at the same time he tells us of eight occasions in the space of nine chapters when Jesus sought the solitudes that he might meditate and rest and pray in peace. Jesus lived the strenuous life, but he lived it sanely and well. He did not allow himself to be worn to a frazzle. He would have considered it a sin against his body, which was a temple of the Holy Spirit, and against his nerves, which must be kept always fit for sympathetic and sufficient ministry, and against his brain, which could be a flawless channel for divine truth only as it maintained its perfect condition. The Perfect Man probably had a perfect physique, and he took care of it to the best of his ability, as any Perfect Servant of God and of man must do.

He was ready to sacrifice his strength and his sleep, his leisure and even his food to meet the demands of pressing need; but when he came to the point where he knew that for effective future ministry the present strenuous ministry must stop for a while, he got away from that place, he fled to the desert solitude or to the mountaintop, he withdrew until his mind was at rest and his nerves had righted again and his physical strength was restored. Sleep and prayer would set him straight in a little while. Sometimes he seemed to prefer prayer to sleep, and he prayed all the night through. Sometimes doubtless he preferred sleep to prayer, and sleep did for him what prayer could not have done. In communion with nature, in communion with God, in communion with his own soul, in communion with the disciple band Jesus maintained his spiritual equanimity always, and his physical and mental and nervous powers speedily returned to normal control. The Gospel of the Strenuous Life is just as clearly the Gospel of Rest and Recreation.

4. This is *The Gospel of Vivid Description.*

"Ewald characterizes Mark's style as the *Schmelz der*

frischen Blume, as the *volle, reine Leben der stoffe,* Kahnis as *drastisch* and *frappant,* Meyer as *malerisch anschaulich.* Lange speaks of the enthusiasm and vividness of realization which accounts for the brevity, rapidity, and somewhat dramatic tone of the narrative, and the introduction of details which give life to the scene." [74] Mark was the Dwight L. Moody of the apostolic age. He was simple and direct in his style. He was radical and forcible in all he had to say. Always brief and to the point, he was full of blunt speech for the ordinary, practical man. Like Bengel, he had the faculty of compressing a deal of matter into small space. He usually packs his thought into briefest compass. There is very little of logic and less of philosophy in the second Gospel. It is a record of impressions and of emotions such as Peter would be likely to experience and to remember, and such as Mark, who seems to have been much like Peter in his personal character, would most appreciate, and such as would appeal most forcibly to the practical Roman mind.

Mark is a most effective story-teller. We see the things he talks about. They impress us more sharply and they seem to have more definite outlines than the corresponding passages in the other evangelists. Mark is the first of the realists, using that word in its best sense. We feel that he is telling us things just as they are, without toning them down or touching them up in the least degree. When he differs with the other synoptics we feel that he is truer to life than they are. There is no reticence or reservation in his account. He speaks out the blunt truth of the matter, and for that reason we value him most.

Some think that John has given us a life of Christ colored somewhat in its picturing by metaphysical and philosophical postulates. Some think that Matthew's life of Christ is dominated more or less with Jewish and dogmatic interests, and that his material is manipulated more or less in order

---

[74] Schaff, *op cit.,* p. 636.

to prove clearly that Jesus was the true and only Messiah. Some think that Luke's life of Christ has the universalistic outlook of the Pauline theology, and that it is built up on the Pauline presuppositions. Mark has given us not a metaphysical nor Messianic nor theological Christ, but the historical Jesus, the real Jesus. It is for that reason that we call Mark the first of the realists in Christian literature. He gives us a realistic picture of the events of the Gospel history. His narratives have the accuracy of photographic reproductions. They stand out before us, clear in every detail.

Hippolytus calls Mark "Mark the stump-fingered, Μᾶρκος ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος." Zahn says, "It is possible that κολοβοδάκτυλος was originally applied as an epithet to Mark because of a congenital shortness of the fingers or a finger, which was noticeable" [75] to all; but Tregelles and others think that that name was given to Mark because he was a deserter. When a soldier cut off his thumb or otherwise mutilated his hand to escape from military service, he became stump-fingered and at the same time a coward and poltroon. Mark deserved the name because he deserted Barnabas and Paul. There was a late legend found in the preface to the Vulgate and other Latin editions of the Gospels which said that Mark had literally mutilated himself in order to escape the responsibilities of the priesthood. We already have suggested that Mark may have had a personal deformity, which may have been caused by an accident with a heavy hammer, and that that would account for both of the names, "Mark the Hammer" and "Mark the Stump-fingered." We mention this title at the present point because Keim has thought that it referred not to any actual deformity but only to the cropped and curtailed character of Mark's style. The second Gospel is brief; its speech is blunt. There is nothing subdued or restrained about it.

[75] Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 446.

That adds to its impressiveness. We rather think that the title found in Hippolytus preserves a tradition concerning a real fact. We question whether it has anything to do with Mark's style.

We note some of the particular characteristics of the second Gospel which help to make it the Gospel of Vivid Description.

(1) Mark usually prefers the present tense, and he represents the action as taking place before us. Matthew in the parallel accounts changes the tenses again and again from the present into the past. Compare 1. 40 with Matt. 8. 2, and 14. 43 with Matt. 26. 47. There are one hundred and fifty-one historic presents in Mark, and of these Matthew retains only twenty-one.

(2) Mark has the imperfect tense two hundred and eighteen times, and Matthew avoids this tense in his parallels by omission and by paraphrase one hundred and eighty-seven times, and thirty-one times he changes it outright into the aorist.

(3) Mark delights to note the beginning of an action and he uses the verb ἤρξατο twenty-six times: he began to teach, he began to preach, he began to speak, he began to rebuke, he began to cry aloud, and so on, 1. 45; 4. 1; 10. 28; 10. 41; 10. 47. The disciples began to make a way through the field when the Pharisees objected, 2. 23. In only six of these cases does Matthew retain the verb *to begin.*

(4) Mark seems to have a liking for diminutives. He uses the Greek terms for *little daughter, little dog, little ear, little child, little boat, little fish,* where the other evangelists do not have the diminutive.

(5) Mark is fond of strong expressions. He has accumulated negatives: 1. 44; 2. 2; 3. 20; 3. 27. He uses the exaggerated πᾶς, "all," for *many* or *a large number,* 1. 5; 1. 37; 2. 13. He has the word πολύς forty-three times and the adverb πολλά fifteen times.

(6) Mark elaborates, repeats, adds word to word and

phrase to phrase to make his descriptions vivid, adequate, full. He says that the leper who was healed went forth and began *to publish it much* and *to blaze abroad* the matter.[76] He says that the good seed, *springing up* and *increasing,* was *bringing forth.*[77] He tells how Peter denied saying, "I neither *know,* nor *understand* what thou sayest." [78]

(7) Mark gives us details of person, number, time, and place which are not paralleled in the other Gospels. He says that the disciples had only one loaf with them in the boat.[79] He tells us that *Peter and James and John and Andrew* were the disciples who asked about the destruction of Jerusalem, and that they were sitting on the mountain *over against the temple* when they did it.[80] He tells us that Jesus sent out the twelve *two by two.*[81] He tells us just where Jesus was sitting when he saw the widow put her mites into the treasury.[82] He alone notes the fact that Jesus was *with the wild beasts* in the wilderness.[83] He mentions the pillow in the boat.[84] Every added fact and phrase of this kind is invaluable to us, as throwing new light upon the life of our Lord. Mark is careful to preserve the very syllables which Christ has uttered on certain occasions.[85] He has certain names which do not occur in any other Gospel, as Alphæus, Jairus, Bartimæus, Salome, Alexander and Rufus.[86]

(8) Mark gives us the looks and the emotions, the actions and the gestures of the Lord and his apostles. He tells us

---

[76] Mark 1. 45.
[77] Mark 4. 8.
[78] Mark 14. 68.
[79] Mark 8. 14.
[80] Mark 13. 3, 4.
[81] Mark 6. 7.
[82] Mark 12. 41.
[83] Mark 1. 13.
[84] Mark 4. 38.
[85] Mark 5. 41; 7. 34; 10. 51; 14. 36.
[86] Mark 2. 14; 5. 22; 10. 46; 15. 40; 15. 21.

that Jesus looked about with anger.[87] He tells us that the Master was filled with indignation when the disciples were turning the little children away.[88] He wondered at the unbelief of the people.[89] He loved the rich young ruler.[90] He was astonished at the agony in the garden of Gethsemane.[91] The Jesus pictured by Mark is a man with all the emotions of other men. He has deep compassion for the multitude that is as sheep without a shepherd.[92] He sighs deeply when his hearers demand a visible and heavenly sign.[93] He walks with an air of tragedy about him on the way to Jerusalem.[94] He dominates the whole situation with the intensity of his zeal as he overturns the tables in the temple.[95] Mark has a multitude of pictorial participles, setting forth these looks and gestures of the actors in his narrative, such as "looking up, looking around, springing up, stooping down, speaking indignantly, turning around, groaning."

Actions speak louder than words oftentimes in this Gospel, as in 3. 5; 10. 14; 10. 21. Note all the particulars found in Mark alone of the method of the cure of the deaf and dumb man in 7. 33: "He took him aside from the multitude privately, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, he sighed"; and then, only after all these preliminaries, he spoke the wonder-working word, "Ephphatha!" Mark is the only one who tells us that the rich young ruler *ran* to Jesus and *kneeled* before him, as he asked his question concerning eternal life,[96] and Mark alone tells us how the young man's countenance fell at the Lord's reply.[97] Mark alone tells us that, when Jesus called Bartimæus to him, the blind

---

[87] Mark 3. 5.
[88] Mark 10. 14.
[89] Mark 6. 6.
[90] Mark 10. 21.
[91] Mark 14. 33.
[92] Mark 6. 34.
[93] Mark 8. 12.
[94] Mark 10. 32.
[95] Mark 11. 15.
[96] Mark 10. 17.
[97] Mark 10. 22.

man cast away his garment and sprang up and came to Jesus.[98] Mark alone shows us the high priest, springing to his feet and striding forth into the midst of the assembly, expressing by his action as well as by his word the indignation he felt toward Jesus.[99] These expressive gestures and actions give to the narrative a graphic and dramatic character which is all its own.

(9) Mark makes us see just as clearly the effect produced upon the people by the words and works of Jesus. We have glimpses of the throngs which pressed upon him and demanded his time and attention till he had no chance to eat. There was no room even about the doors, we are told. There were so many people upon the shore that Jesus was compelled to enter a boat and put off a little from the beach that he might escape the crowding and that all might see and hear. Sometimes those who listen are filled with awe and wonder,[100] and sometimes those who look on are amazed and begin to fear.[101]

(10) There is an objective and photographic character about these accounts which makes them the main source of all artistic and dramatic details in modern reproductions. The artists and the preachers go to Mark to get the graphic touches which make these scenes life-like and real. They seem to be the accounts of an eyewitness, and they appeal to the eye to-day. Streeter calls them "a collection of vignettes—scenes from the Life of the Master," [102] and Farrar says of them: "They are painted as it were from the photograph of them on Peter's memory. Jesus 'looks round' on the worshipers. He 'takes the little children in his arms,' and (how mothers will thank Mark for that detail!) 'lays his hand on them and blesses them.' . . . Take

[98] Mark 10. 50.
[99] Mark 14. 60.
[100] Mark 1. 22, 27; 2. 12; 6. 2.
[101] Mark 4. 41; 6. 51; 10. 24, 26, 32.
[102] Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p. 220.

by way of example the description of the storm upon the lake. In Mark alone do we see the waves breaking over and half swamping the little ship. In Mark alone do we see Jesus in his utter weariness sleeping on the leather cushion of the steersman at the stern.

"Take another scene, the feeding of the five thousand. Mark alone tells us of the fresh, green grass on which they sat down by hundreds and by fifties; and the word which he uses for 'companies' means literally 'flowerbeds,' as though to Peter those multitudes, in their festal passover attire, with its many-colored Oriental brightness of red and blue, looked like the patches of crocus and poppy and tulip and amaryllis which he had seen upon the mountain slopes. Again, in the narrative of the transfiguration, it is in Mark that we see most clearly the dazzling robes of the transfigured Lord as they shed their golden luster over Hermon's snow; and it is Mark who shows us most vividly the contrast of that scene of peace and radiance with the tumult and agitation of the crowd below—the father's heartrending anguish at the foaming and convulsion of the agonized demoniac boy, the trouble of the disciples, and the noble passions of the Lord. As you gaze on Raphael's immortal picture of the transfiguration, you will see at once that it is from the narrative of Mark that it derives most of its intensity, its movement, its coloring, its contrast, and its power. It is these gifts of the evangelist which make one writer say of him that he 'wears a richly embroidered garment'; and another—thinking of his bright independence and originality—that in his Gospel we breathe 'a scent as of fresh flowers.'" [103] Fresh flowers! That is why we value the second Gospel so highly. It was the first to be written, and there is a freshness about it which is unrivaled in any of the others.

5. This is *The Disciple Gospel.*

---

[103] Farrar, *op cit.*, pp. 60, 61.

Weiss thinks that this Gospel might properly be called by this name.[104] He points out that much of its contents has to do with the external history and the inner development of the disciples, and a disproportionate number of the stories concern the disciples and a whole series of its statements emanate from the inner circle of the chosen three.[105] This is all true. Jesus cares for his more immediate disciples and sees that they have their proper rest,[106] and gives them their needed instruction as they seem able to bear it.[107] Again and again he has to chide them and discipline them. They seem almost incredibly stupid and dull of hearing and hard of heart. Jesus rebukes them for their slowness to perceive his meaning,[108] and for their niggardliness of reverence and love.[109] They follow in fear and amazement behind him at times.[110] They flee and leave him at the mercy of his foes at the last.[111]

It is not a very pleasing picture of the disciples which Mark gives us. Possibly that is because it is true to the life, and the disciples were not such immaculate characters as the reverence of later times has been prone to consider them. They were disciples, but they were not saints as yet. Among the disciples Peter is the most prominent figure in this Gospel, and these intimate reminiscences of the disciple band in all probability came originally from him.

6. This is *Peter's Gospel.*

All that we have said about the Gospel of Vivid Description bears its testimony to this fact. We have in this Gospel the narratives of an eyewitness, and we have no reason to

---

[104] Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii, p. 241.
[105] Weiss, *op. cit.*, ii, 257.
[106] Mark 6. 31.
[107] Mark 1. 38; 8. 31.
[108] Mark 8. 17.
[109] Mark 14. 6.
[110] Mark 10. 32.
[111] Mark 14. 50.

think that Mark himself was an eyewitness. He merely has recorded what Peter said in his preaching. Almost all the contents of this Gospel might rest upon the personal knowledge of Peter.

(1) It begins where Peter's own recollections begin, not with the preexistence of Jesus, as in the fourth Gospel, and not with the stories of annunciation and of the birth of Jesus, as in the first and the third Gospels, but with the preaching of John the Baptist, which Peter himself had heard, and the baptism of Jesus, which he may have seen.

(2) The first thing narrated in the account of the active ministry of Jesus is the call of Peter and Andrew his brother.[112]

(3) The whole of the first part of Christ's ministry centers in the first visit of the Master to Peter's home; and in Mark alone we are told that his home was occupied by the two brothers, Peter and Andrew, together.[113] Luke and Matthew mention Simon alone in this connection. It was a very strenuous day which Jesus spent there at Capernaum, and all the city was gathered about the door in the evening. The next morning, a great while before day, Jesus slipped away to recruit his physical and spiritual powers in prayer. There must have been something of a feeling of consternation among the people when they learned that Jesus was gone. It was Peter who with characteristic promptness organized a searching party and went forth at the head of it to find the missing Master. It is in Mark alone that the name of Simon is mentioned in this connection.[114]

(4) Peter's great confession is the climax of this Gospel.[115]

(5) The Gospel closes with the command of the angel to the women, "Go, tell his disciples and *Peter*, He goeth be-

[112] Mark 1. 16.
[113] Mark 1. 29-32.
[114] Mark 1. 36.
[115] Mark 8. 28.

fore you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.[116]

(6) Here alone do we read that it was Peter who called the Lord's attention to the fig tree withered away from the roots,[117] and there are many other such allusions and incidents recorded as indicate the presence and the remembrance of Peter himself.

(7) The program of the second Gospel is given in Peter's summary of the apostolic preaching as he outlined it to Cornelius.[118] This sermon of Peter to Cornelius has been called the Gospel of Mark in a nutshell.[119] A still shorter summary of its contents can be found in the beginning of Peter's sermon at Pentecost.[120] Another statement, shortest of all, is contained in Peter's declaration of the necessities of apostolic testimony made in the upper room.[121]

(8) The whole Gospel is filled with the Petrine spirit. All the energy of Peter is manifest in its hurried narrative. All the objective and impulsive and comparatively superficial observations of Peter are in evidence here. His vivid impressions and his practical interests are apparent on every page. In the stilling of the storm upon the lake Matthew and Luke simply record the fact that Jesus rebuked the raging of the wind, and there was a great calm, but Mark preserves the very words of the Master. He spoke to the wind and said, "Be silent!" and its raging ceased at the word. Then he turned to the sea and said, "Be muzzled!" and its roaring was cut off at once. Those were strange terms to be applied in this way. Jesus spoke to the wind as if it were a personality, and could hear and obey. He spoke to the sea as if it were a sea-monster or as he spoke on another occasion to a demon,[122] as if it had a mouth which could be muzzled and this were the best method to

[116] Mark 16. 7.
[117] Mark 11. 21.
[118] Acts 10. 36-40.
[119] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 633.
[120] Acts 2. 22-24.
[121] Acts 1. 22.
[122] Mark 1. 25.

put an end to its noise. They were strange terms, not to be forgotten by anyone who had heard them. They made their vivid impression upon Peter and he has given them to Mark.

Take one of the miracles recorded by Mark alone, and notice the dramatic impressiveness of its recital. Jesus takes the blind man by the hand and leads him outside the village. There he makes spittle and puts it upon the blind man's eyes. Then he lays his hands upon the blind man's head, and asks him, "Do you see anything?" For the first time in his life, it may be, the blind man looks, and we can almost see the eager expectation in his countenance and we can almost hear his awe-struck ejaculations as the reality of the miracle dawns upon him. "I see men! . . . I see them as trees standing straight and still! . . . No, now I see them moving! . . . They are walking!" Then Jesus laid his hands upon the blind man's eyes, and the man looked steadfastly, and to his straining vision all things became clear. Peter had watched the whole transaction closely, and it is his clear memory of it which Mark has recorded.[123]

(9) Eusebius[124] pointed out the fact that Peter in his preaching omitted many things in the gospel narrative which reflected credit upon himself, and that in consequence these things were not found in the second Gospel. (*a*) We are not told in this Gospel that Peter walked upon the sea. That surely was one of the most wonderful things which ever happened in a human life, and it is not mentioned here. (*b*) At the time of the great confession we are not told in this Gospel that the Master pronounced Peter blessed as one to whom the Father had made special revelation; and we do not read that Peter was called the rock upon which Christ would build his church. (*c*) Peter was one of the two chosen disciples who were sent to make the preparations for the Last Supper. Luke tells us that fact, but Mark does not mention Peter's name at this point.

[123] Mark 8. 22-26.

[124] Demon. Evang., iii, 5.

(*d*) Luke tells us of another singling out of Peter for the Master's especial solicitude and prayer. Jesus said to Peter directly, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan desired to have all of you apostles, that he might sift all of you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, Simon, that thy faith may fail not; and do thou, when thou hast turned again, and become steadfast, strengthen and establish all the brethren." [125] It was a most noteworthy honor bestowed upon Peter, that such special supplication should be made for him and that such a responsibility for all his brethren should be laid upon him. Mark omits all mention of it. (*e*) We learn from John that Peter was the disciple who drew his sword at the time of the arrest of Jesus and struck at the high priest's servant.[126] It was a foolish thing to do, but it was an evidence of Peter's courage and loyalty; and his name is not mentioned in this narrative in Mark. (*f*) According to the other Gospels, Peter was the first of the apostles to see the risen Lord; but we never would have learned that fact from Mark's record. On the contrary, we are explicitly told in the appendix to this Gospel that Mary Magdalene was the first who saw Jesus after the resurrection.

(10) The second Gospel not only omits certain things which might have reflected honor upon Peter, but it seems to be careful to record certain things which were calculated to humble him. (*a*) When Peter reasoned with Jesus that he ought not to go up to Jerusalem to suffer and die, we read here alone that Jesus turned about and saw that the disciples were all observant and listening, and then he rebuked Peter and said, "Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men." [127] The record in Mark makes it evident that it was a public and most scathing humiliation. (*b*) On the mount

[125] Luke 22. 31, 32.
[126] John 18. 10.
[127] Mark 8. 33.

of transfiguration when Peter said, "Let us build three tabernacles here," Mark explains that utterly foolish speech by the statement, "He knew not what to say."[128] Most people would have kept silent under such circumstances; but Peter always talked whether he knew what to say or not. He always was inclined to say something whether wise or otherwise. In this case he concluded afterward that he had been far from wise in his speech. Morison represents him as saying, "I thought I should say something; but really I did not know what to say, I was so confounded and overwhelmed with awe. In the end I actually said something foolish."[129] (*c*) In the Gethsemane scene this Gospel singles Peter out for especial rebuke. When the Master came and found them sleeping he said unto Peter, "Simon, sleepest thou? couldest thou not watch one hour?"[130] (*d*) The account of Peter's disgraceful denial of the Lord is given with greater fullness in the second Gospel than in any other. Here only we read that Peter stood *in the light* of the fire where his features could be easily recognized, and yet he denied his identity when they accused him of being a disciple. Here only we are told that Peter had two warnings in the two crowings of the cock, and that his denial therefore was doubly inexcusable. In the other Gospels we read that Peter went out and wept bitterly; here we read simply that he wept.

If we are right in following the church tradition concerning the relation of the apostle Peter to the second Gospel, the explanation for these omissions and additions in the narratives directly concerning Peter himself may be found, as Eusebius suggested, in Peter's personal humility in his preaching. It is possible that he maintained silence on certain points and that he did not hesitate to detail certain other things not so creditable to himself.

[128] Mark 9. 6.
[129] Morison, Commentary on Mark, p. xxxvi.
[130] Mark 14. 37.

7. This is *The Gospel of the Strong Son of God.*

(1) We notice, first, the announcement of the first verse, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." This Gospel declares Jesus to be the Son of God with power, a supernatural power unequaled in human history. We are reminded of the opening invocation in Tennyson's In Memoriam:

> "Strong Son of God, Immortal Love
> Whom we, that have not seen thy face,
> By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
> Believing where we cannot prove;—"

This whole Gospel emphasizes the fact that Jesus is the *Strong* Son of God.

(2) We already have noted that the climax of the Gospel comes in that great confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ." [131]

(3) At the close of the crucifixion history the heathen centurion makes the startling statement, "Truly this man was the Son of God." [132]

(4) In accordance with his emphasis upon this aspect of the Lord's ministry the Gospel according to Mark is characteristically the Gospel of Miracles. Miracles are more in evidence here than parables or discourses. Matthew has fifteen parables. Mark has only four, and these four are in briefest form. But of the thirty-six miracles of which we have accounts in the Gospels, Mark has the record of one half of them. There are eighteen miracles in sixteen chapters. In these Jesus displays his power over disease in eight, and over nature in five, and over demons in four, and over death in one. All the heathen world was looking for some power which would protect them from evil spirits. Men always have been striving for power over nature, and they always have longed for power over disease and death.

[131] Mark 8. 29.
[132] Mark 15. 39.

Mark proclaimed to the whole Roman empire in this Gospel, "At last the power for which the ages and the many races of men have looked and longed has been manifested in Jesus the Christ. He was the Strong Son of God, Immortal Love united to Marvelous Might."

There is no miraculo-phobia in Mark. There is a miracle-mania instead. He emphasizes the miraculous throughout. Nearly one half of the chapters of this book close with some comprehensive summing up of Christ's ministry of power.[133] In Matt. 16. 28 we read the prophecy of Jesus that some of those standing by would not die until they saw the Son of man coming in his kingdom. In the parallel passage in Mark 9. 1 the prophecy reads that they would not die until they saw the kingdom of God come with power. Nearly one half of this Gospel is given to the narration of the deeds of power which proved that one mightier than men and mightier than any of the heathen gods, even the mighty Son of God himself, had appeared to save the race. That is the ultimate end aimed at in all these marvels. The last statement we find in the appendix to the Gospel is that the apostles went forth and preached everywhere after the ascension, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed.[134] The Lord is still at work. His mighty deeds never have ended. They will not end until all the world has been reached and the whole creation has been redeemed.

Mark shows us again and again how the work of Jesus astonished the people of that generation in which he lived. "They were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him." [135] The paralytic was healed, and then we read, "They were all amazed, and glorified God, saying,

[133] See Chaps. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16.
[134] Mark 16. 20.
[135] Mark 1. 27.

We never saw it on this fashion."[136] The daughter of Jairus was restored to her parents and the news was carried to the people, and we read, "They were amazed straightway with a great amazement."[137] He taught in the synagogue, and Mark tells us that "many hearing him were astonished."[138] Jesus walked upon the sea and stilled the storm, and Mark says that the disciples "were sore amazed in themselves" at all these things.[139] A deaf man who had an impediment in his speech was brought to Jesus and his ears were opened and his tongue loosed so that he spake plain. Then, says Mark, "They were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak."[140] All along the course of Jesus through this Gospel the people are astonished by his words and his works. He arouses amazement on every hand and at every turn. If these things were true at the beginning what will be true at the end? The whole universe will be astonished at the glorious outcome of the gospel of Jesus the Christ, the Strong Son of God.

(5) It is a Mighty Victor who is presented to us in the pages of this Gospel. He has power over demons, disease, and death. There is no malady he may not cure. There is no Satanic power he may not bind and despoil of all its vaunted wealth. He is the Strongest of the strong. Death, the universal conqueror, has no power over him. He healed the leper with a touch. He healed the paralytic or the dumb with a word. He recalled the dead to life. He defied any prejudice of the Jews which was not founded upon the prescriptions of the Mosaic Law. He broke the Sabbath regulations of the scribes without hesitation. He sat down to dine with publicans and sinners with perfect composure.

---

[136] Mark 2. 12.
[137] Mark 5. 42.
[138] Mark 6. 2.
[139] Mark 6. 51.
[140] Mark 7. 37.

He claimed authority to forgive sins. He defied his foes at will, and foiled their designs against him whenever he chose. He cleansed the temple from all of those who defiled it and turned it into a den of thieves. He faced the Sanhedrin in calm contempt. He was a Victor even while he hung upon the cross; and he rose from the grave to be crowned Eternal Victor and to be seated on the throne. "Could anything appeal more strongly to the Roman mind than this idea of a mighty conqueror, before whom nothing was able to stand—a conqueror who was destined to achieve world-wide empire? And in the hour of her weakness what encouragement ought to come to the church from the reflection that the Mighty Christ whom Mark portrays is moving steadily forward, overcoming all opposition, subduing all things to the will of heaven, and establishing on the earth a kingdom that cannot be shaken!" [141] We hasten now to add another characterization of the second Gospel, which seems to us to represent its distinguishing feature.

8. This is *The Gospel of Service.*

The second Gospel is the Gospel of Jesus as the Servant of all. The Gospel of the Son of God would as a matter of course be the Gospel of the Servant of Jehovah. Sonship and service always are joined in the Scriptures. In Exodus we read, "Israel is my son, my first-born; let my son go, that he may serve me." [142] Paul exhorts all the sons of God to present their bodies holy, acceptable unto God, which is their spiritual service.[143] The incarnate Son of God, the First-Born, did that. He took upon him the form of a servant.[144] His life was a life of devoted and incessant service. The pentecostal church called the Lord by that title, "Thy holy Servant Jesus, whom thou didst anoint." [145] They said,

[141] Campbell, The Teachings of the Books, p. 52.
[142] Exod. 4. 22, 23.
[143] Rom. 12. 1, 2.
[144] Phil. 2. 7.
[145] Acts 4. 27.

"God . . . hath glorified his Servant Jesus." [146] Matthew presented the King; Mark presents the Servant. The symbol of Matthew was the lion; that of Mark is the ox. This is the Gospel of the Minister, the Gospel of the ministering Christ, the One who came not to be ministered unto but to minister.

This contrast between the second Gospel and the other synoptics is apparent, (1) in the omissions in Mark's narrative. (*a*) He has no royal genealogy, no story of a supernatural conception, no worship by Wise Men come from afar to offer their gifts to a new-born King, as Matthew had. (*b*) He does not begin with any reference to preexistent and everexistent glory, as John does. (*c*) Mark has no Sermon on the Mount, laying down the laws for a new kingdom, for here we have the servant and not the king. (*d*) Here we find no national manifesto and arraignment and judgment, such as the other Gospels have. (*e*) Here there is no reference to his right to summon twelve legions of angels to his help. (*f*) Here there is no promise of paradise to the thief on the cross. These things belong to the prerogatives of a king. (*g*) It has even been suggested that the Gospel closed abruptly at 12. 8 as it begins abruptly with the active ministry, because this is the Gospel of Jesus as the Servant. "A servant comes, fulfils his task, and departs—we do not ask about his lineage, nor follow his subsequent history." [147] Mark himself was a servant, simply an attendant upon Barnabas, Peter, and Paul. He was useful in ministering to these greater men, and his ideal came to be that of faithful administration of daily duties in the service of the church. This may in some measure account for the emphasis upon this side of the character of Jesus. Mark represents him as the perfect Servant of men, as well as the perfect Servant of God.

(2) The spirit of Jesus throughout is the self-surrender-

[146] Acts 3. 13.

[147] The International Standard Bible Encyclopædia, p. 1989.

ing spirit of devotion and love. The ardor of his spirit and the fervor of his service are made noticeable in this Gospel. The Spirit *drives* him into the wilderness.[148] He is angry and grieved.[149] He sighs deeply.[150] He is moved with indignation.[151] His friends declared he was beside himself, crazy, and that he ought to be put under restraint.[152] These are indications of the great stress upon him all the time.

Jesus is an indefatigable Servant in this Gospel, never faltering in his devotion, always ready at any call of need.[153] He is a model to all ministers, saying little and working much. He is tireless in sympathy and in labor, quiet and unostentatious, ready and reliable. He was the holy Servant of the Father in everything. He was wholly the servant of men all the time.

(3) In this Gospel alone do we find the explicit statement of the limitation of knowledge on the part of the Incarnate One.[154]

(4) The only parable peculiar to this Gospel seems to emphasize the point of the utter dependence of man upon the higher powers and the necessity of his utter obedience to their behests.[155]

(5) "It is a remarkable fact that, while this Gospel depicts the Jesus of history so preeminently in his power, it records with literal faithfulness things which might seem so far to limit that power. It tells us how the unclean spirits first resisted, 1. 24, and how he could do no mighty work in Nazareth because of their unbelief, 6. 5. It describes with precise and vivid circumstance those miracles which were wrought not instantaneously and by word, but with comparative slowness and by the use of means, 7. 31-35; 8. 22-26. It is also rich in touches which speak to the identity of Christ's human nature with ours in feeling and in the

[148] Mark 1. 12.
[149] Mark 3. 5.
[150] Mark 8. 12.
[151] Mark 10. 14.
[152] Mark 3. 21.
[153] Mark 1. 35-38; 3. 20; 6. 31.
[154] Mark 13. 32.
[155] Mark 4. 26-29.

experience of infirmity, revealing him not only in his compassion, 6. 34; 8. 2; his love, 10. 21; his majesty and serenity, 4. 37-40; 9. 2-9; but in his sense of hunger, 11. 12; his need of rest, 4. 38; his anger and displeasure, 3. 5; 10. 14; his sighing, 7. 34; 8. 12; his wonder, 6. 6; his grief, 3. 5; his longing for solitude, 1. 35; 6. 30-32."[156] The power of the Son of God in this Gospel is the power of a Servant, dependent in real humanity.

(6) It is a strange and most interesting fact that Mark persistently and consistently omits the title "Lord," as applied to Jesus, throughout the record of his earthly ministry. (*a*) In Matt. 8. 2 we read that a leper came worshiping him and saying, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." We turn to Mark 1. 40 and we read of the same incident and we are told that the leper made the same speech, except that he omits the title "Lord." The leper said, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." We possibly might never notice a slight difference of that sort if it occurred but once; but we find that it runs through the entire Gospel. (*b*) In Matt. 8. 25 we read of the tempest on the sea while Jesus was sleeping, and how the disciples awoke him saying, "Save, Lord; we perish." Then we turn to Mark 4. 38 and we read that the disciples said, "Teacher, carest thou not that we perish?" According to Mark, they called Jesus "Teacher" and not "Lord." (*c*) In Matt. 17. 4 Peter on the mount of transfiguration says to Jesus, "Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah." Surely, if there was any one moment in the life of Jesus when Peter would have been most likely to have called Jesus "Lord," it would have been here when the transfiguration glory was blinding their eyes; yet when we turn to the Gospel according to Mark, which is supposed to record Peter's own reminiscences of these things, and read of this experience there, we find that Peter said to Jesus, "Rabbi,

[156] Salmond, in Hastings's Bible Dictionary, vol. iii, p. 255.

it is good for us to be here," 9. 5. Surely, Peter would be the best authority for what he himself said on this occasion, and we must conclude, therefore, that even at the transfiguration Peter called Jesus "Rabbi" and not "Lord." (*d*) In Matt. 17. 15 we read that when they came down from the mount of transfiguration a man met them who kneeled to Jesus and said, "Lord, have mercy on my son: for he is epileptic." Then we turn to Mark 9. 17 and we find that the man said, "Teacher, I brought unto thee my son." "Teacher," not "Lord"! (*e*) In Luke 18. 41 Jesus asks the blind man at Jericho, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" And he said, "Lord, that I may receive my sight." In Mark 10. 51 Jesus asks the same question, but the blind man answers, "Rabboni, that I may receive my sight." "Rabboni," not "Lord"! Mark prefers to call Jesus Rabboni, Rabbi, Teacher. He makes frequent references to his teaching, and the words *διδαχή*, "teaching," and *διδάσκω*, "teach," are found more often in this Gospel than in any other. (*f*) When at the Last Supper Jesus said that one of the apostles should betray him we read in Matt. 26. 22 that every one said to him, "Is it I, Lord?" We compare Mark 14. 19 and we find that they each asked, "Is it I?" but they omit the title "Lord."

This, then, is characteristic of the Gospel according to Mark throughout. It never calls Jesus "Lord" before his resurrection except on one occasion. (*g*) In Mark 7. 28 the Syrophœnician woman, a heathen woman with all the heathen superstitions, says to Jesus, "Yea, Lord; even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs." With this single exception, in which the title is used not by any disciple but by a heathen Greek woman, this oldest of the Gospels carefully refrains from calling Jesus "Lord" until after his resurrection from the dead. (*h*) In Mark 16. 19 we read, "So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God." (*i*) Then in the next verse, the closing

verse of the appendix to the Gospel, 16. 20, we read that they went forth and preached everywhere, "the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with the signs that followed." This title "Lord" is the only title given to Jesus in the post-resurrection appendix to the second Gospel.

It may be possible that this uniform practice of the second Gospel may represent the opinion of Peter that the title "Lord" was rightly applicable to the Saviour only after he had passed from the humiliation of the incarnation to the exaltation of the resurrection and ascension existence in unrestricted divine power. It may represent the uniform practice of Peter himself. (*j*) At any rate, when we turn to the sermon which Peter preached at Pentecost we find that he begins with the "man Jesus," approved of God, but crucified and buried, Acts 2. 22, 23. (*k*) Then he goes on to say, "This Jesus did God raise up," 2. 32; and it was the resurrected Jesus whom "David called Lord," 2. 34. (*l*) When he comes to the conclusion and the climax of that sermon he makes the statement that Jesus has a right to a new title now: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified," 2. 36. We have known him as Jesus; we will know him henceforth as Lord! The resurrection and ascension have proved his right to bear that name. Mark has refrained from calling Jesus "Lord" during the time of his public ministry. This title is granted to Jesus only after his exaltation to the Father's throne. In the second Gospel Jesus is a Teacher, a Minister, a Servant, and not a Lord.

IV. Noteworthy Additions to the Gospel Narrative

There is very little material in Mark which is not reproduced either in Matthew or Luke. The incidents or sayings which are peculiar to Mark fill not more than fifty verses[157]

[157] Hawkins, Horæ Synopticæ, ii.

and form only about seven per cent of the total contents. We note some of these things found only in Mark:

1. There is one parable not found elsewhere, that of the seed growing without man's interference between sowing and harvest.[158]

2. There are two miracles of healing found only in Mark, that of the deaf and dumb man, and that of the blind man.[159]

3. Here only we read that the friends of Jesus thought seriously of interfering with his ministry and violently restraining him because they had concluded that he was beside himself.[160]

4. Here only we find the statement that during his youth and young manhood Jesus was a carpenter and worked at the carpenter's trade.[161] Matthew changes the passage to read, "the son of the carpenter." [162] Doubtless Joseph the father was a carpenter and Jesus the son followed his father's trade.

5. Mark alone gives us Christ's abrogation of the Levitical law concerning the clean and unclean meats: "This he said, making all meats clean." [163] It was as if Jesus had taken the Bible of his day, the Book of the Law, and had torn a leaf right out of it. He declared that the eleventh chapter of Leviticus was out of date henceforth, and no one was to be bound by its regulations. He did not know that modern critics would decide that the so-called Law of Holiness there in the book of Leviticus was of comparatively late date and, since post exilic in its origin, not to be compared with the primitive Mosaic regulations in its authority. He did not rule out these refinements of the ritual on any grounds of original authorship. With his clear sight and common sense it seemed to be self-evident that men were not defiled by their food, but by evil thoughts and prac-

---

[158] Mark 4. 26-29.
[159] Mark 7. 32-37; 8. 22-26.
[160] Mark 3. 21.
[161] Mark 6. 3.
[162] Matt. 13. 55.
[163] Mark 7. 19.

tices. A man's stomach might be upset and it would right itself by the processes of nature; but if a man's heart were defiled, it would not right itself naturally. That defilement remained and was the prolific source of all wrongdoing.

It did not matter so much what was in a man's stomach; it mattered much what was in a man's heart. He might eat anything which was wholesome and not be defiled. He might be a meat eater and be a good man. He might observe all the distinctions laid down between clean and unclean meats there in Leviticus and be a villain. He might be a vegetarian and not be a saint. It was not that which went into a man's stomach which defiled him; it was that which went into his heart. He could not retain anything in his stomach very long; he could cherish corruption within his heart. It was the common sense of a carpenter, a plain working man, which spoke in these words. If any regulations in the book of Leviticus ran counter to the dictates of common sense, Jesus for one was ready to set them aside. Ritual purity did not count in comparison with purity of heart. Ritual regulations which did not approve themselves to the reason might with reason be abandoned at once. It always has been the plain man's attitude to ecclesiastical prescriptions. It was the attitude of Jesus. He had no such reverence for the Word of God as contained in a book that he was not willing to listen to the word of God in his own soul. If the two ever came into conflict, the book was set aside.

6. Mark alone has the three questions put by Jesus to the disciples, "Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?" [164] It was a threefold indictment of their stupidity.

7. Mark alone has the incident of the young man who fled naked from the garden.[165]

---

[164] Mark 8. 18.

[165] Mark 14. 51, 52.

8. Mark alone tells us that Jesus was smitten by the servants of the chief priests.[166]

9. We learn from Mark alone that Pilate was so surprised when he heard that Jesus was already dead that he sent for the centurion to have his corroboration of the news.[167] These are minor particulars, some of them, but we could ill spare any of them.

V. The Style of the Gospel

We add just a few words on the style of the book. The Greek of the second Gospel is comparatively poor and sometimes incorrect. We note the following characteristics of style:

1. There is a poverty of connecting particles. Take 3. 1-26 for an example. The conjunction "and" occurs in these verses forty-six times, and thirty times it is used in connecting sentences with each other. The conjunction "for" is found twice and the conjunction "but" is found once; and that ends the list in this passage. Mark uses only the simpler conjunctions as a rule, and the simplest of them all most of the time. "In Bruder's Konkordanz, under *καί*, *in oratione historica,* Matthew occupies four columns, Luke six and a half, John one and three fourths, Acts two and two thirds, while the short Gospel according to Mark occupies six and a half. Even when the relation is adversative Mark is satisfied with *καί*, as in 6. 19 and 12. 12." [168]

2. There are several broken and irregular grammatical constructions in this Gospel; for example, 3. 15; 4. 11; 4. 15; 6. 22; 9. 41; 13. 14; 14. 72. In some of these passages it is difficult to determine the exact meaning because of the difficult constructions. There are not as many flagrant errors of grammar in Mark, however, as in the Apocalypse.

3. Mark has nine or more of what the Greek gramma-

[166] Mark 14. 65.
[167] Mark 15. 44.
[168] Zahn, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

rians called vulgarisms, all of which are avoided in the parallel accounts by Luke.

4. Mark is more Hebraistic than Matthew or Luke and has more genuine Semitic idioms than even the Apocalypse of John.

VI. The Most Authentic and Authoritative Gospel

We have seen that the consensus of modern scholarship tends to the conclusion that Mark was the first chronologically to compose a Gospel. He is not an abbreviator of the Gospel according to Matthew or of any other Gospel. On the other hand, there are numerous and convincing evidences of the fact that the other Gospel writers had the narrative of Mark, or one very similar to it, before them when they wrote. Mark has not abbreviated them; they have revised and enlarged him. In Mark's record, therefore, we come nearest in time to the words and the works of the Lord. This is the primitive evangelic tradition.

Dr. Horton has said of it: "The famous Church of Saint Mark at Venice is singular amongst mediæval churches in two respects. In the first place, the mosaics which cover it, wholly within and largely without, form, as it were, an illustrated Bible which speaks rather to the eye than to the ear; and, secondly, in this church Christ and the cross take the place of preeminence, which elsewhere is occupied by Mary and the saints. Now, curiously enough, these two features of the great Church of Saint Mark at Venice accurately reflect the two most striking characteristics of the Gospel which is called by the name of Mark. This Gospel stands out among the four as the most picturesque—the one in which everything passes, as it were, before the eye. Its chapters are like the mosaics in the great church, or like the cartoons of a great painter, presenting the appearance and the actions of Christ. Further, this Gospel is so occupied with Christ alone, that the other figures which appear in the canvases of Matthew and Luke—Joseph and Mary,

John the Baptist, the disciples, the groups of Jews—all sink into the background; they are mere suggestions; their portraits are not attempted. This Gospel is in literature the earliest, the simplest, the most direct likeness of Jesus alone. The other Gospels have their distinguishing merits—each is invaluable, but for unity and completeness of impression, for lifelike contact with the subject of the narrative, for immediate perception of our Lord as he would appear to the eyes of the men who knew him—to such eyes as Peter's, for example, during the brief period from the beginning of his public ministry to his premature death—for these purposes this second Gospel stands unique among our New Testament treasures." [169]

Bishop Westcott has given us this estimate of the second Gospel: "In substance and style and treatment the Gospel according to Mark is essentially a transcript from life. The course and the issue of facts are imaged in it with the clearest outline. If all other arguments against the mythic origin of the evangelic narratives were wanting, this vivid and simple record, stamped with the most distinct impress of independence and originality—totally unconnected with the symbolism of the Old Dispensation, totally independent of the deeper reasonings of the New—would be sufficient to refute a theory subversive of all faith in history." [170] It is doubtful whether we could say as much concerning any of the other Gospels. They all bear evidence of more or less doctrinal bias, and their accounts are colored more or less by the theological viewpoint of the authors.

The difference between Mark and Matthew, who probably came next in chronological order, can be seen in any comparison of their parallel accounts.

1. The second Gospel does not hesitate to ascribe all the natural human emotions to Jesus. Again and again Matthew omits the descriptions given by Mark, as in Mark

[169] The Cartoons of Saint Mark, pp. 3, 4.

[170] Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, p. 369.

3. 5, "had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved"; and 1. 41, "having been moved with compassion"; and 1. 43, "having sternly charged him"; and 3. 21, "He is beside himself"; and 6. 6, "he marveled"; and 8. 12, "having groaned in spirit"; and 10. 14, "he was moved with indignation"; and 10. 21, "looking upon him loved him." All of these emotional experiences of Jesus are omitted in Matthew's account. Is this an evidence of a growing reverence for Jesus which hesitated to chronicle the fact that he had shown the same emotions with ordinary humanity? It has been so suggested. At any rate, we feel that in Mark's narrative we come closer to the real Jesus and that we see him as he is, with no glamour of reverence thrown about his person and no reservation as to his real character.

2. The second Gospel tells us that Jesus wished for certain things which he did not obtain, and found that there were certain things which he could not do; and Matthew either omits these statements altogether or so modifies them as to leave the inability of Jesus out of sight in a large measure. For example, in Mark we read in 1. 45, "Jesus no longer was able to enter into a city"; and in 6. 5, "he was not able to do any miracle there." Matt. 13. 58 changes this statement into "He did not many miracles there." The following statements as to the desires of Jesus, found in Mark, are omitted altogether in Matthew. In Mark 6. 48 we read, "He was willing to pass them by"; and in 7. 24, "He entered into a house, and he was desiring no one to know it; and he was not able to escape observation"; and in 9. 30, "He not desiring that any man should know it."

3. Mark represents Jesus as asking questions for information continually. Matthew for the most part leaves these questions out of his narrative. For example, the questions asked by Jesus, recorded in Mark 5. 9; 5. 30; 6. 38; 8. 12; 8. 23; 9. 12; 9. 16; 9. 21; 9. 33; 10. 3; 14. 14 are all omitted by Matthew.

4. The following differences between Mark and Matthew

are noticeable and may be due to the cause we have mentioned. (*a*) In Mark 6. 3 we read that Jesus was a carpenter; but in Matt. 13. 55 it is changed into "the son of a carpenter." (*b*) In Mark 10. 18 Jesus asks, "Why dost thou call me good?" In Matt. 19. 17 the question becomes, "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?" (*c*) In Mark 1. 32, 33 we read that all who were sick were brought to Jesus and that he healed many. Matt. 8. 16 just changes the terms about and tells us that many were brought and all were healed. (*d*) Mark records two miracles of healing in which Jesus made use of physical means and in one of which the cure seems to be gradual and effected with some difficulty. Matthew omits these miracles, and records others in which the cure was effected with a word. (*e*) Mark 9. 26 tells us how the poor epileptic boy suffered after Jesus had commanded the dumb and deaf spirit to come out of him, "Having . . . torn him much, he came out: and the boy became as one dead; insomuch that the more part said, He is dead." Matthew omits all these details. We might draw the same contrast between Mark and Luke or between Mark and John as between Mark and Matthew. All the other evangelists believe just as thoroughly as Mark in the real humanity of Jesus and have given manifold proofs of it in their narratives, but there is an openness and unreservedness in Mark's account which we miss in the others. He is frank in statement and free from dogmatic bias of any sort. He reverences nothing so much as the plain and unadorned truth of things.

5. He does not shield the apostles at any point. Here again we can contrast his narrative with that of Matthew. (*a*) In Mark 4. 13 Jesus rebukes his disciples, "Do ye not know this parable? and how shall ye appreciate all the parables?" In Matt. 13. 16 this rebuke is omitted and a blessing recorded in its place, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see." (*b*) In Mark 8. 17 Jesus is rebuking the disciples again and he says to them, "Do ye not yet perceive, neither under-

stand? have ye your heart hardened? Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?" In the parallel account in Matt. 16. 9 all of this rebuke is omitted. (*c*) Again in Mark 6. 52 we find the statement, "They understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened." This statement is omitted in Matthew 14. 33. (*d*) In Mark 9. 10 we read that the disciples were questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean, and in 9. 33, 34 they are disputing on the public way as to who was the greater among them. Matthew omits all record of these disputes. (*e*) In Mark 9. 32 we read, "And they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask him." In Matt. 17. 23 this is softened down to the comparatively complimentary statement, "And they were exceedingly sorry." (*f*) Again in 14. 40 Mark says that the disciples knew not what to answer Jesus; and Matthew omits this statement of their incapacity.[171] These contrasts between Mark and Matthew are sufficient to show that we have a primary account in Mark which has been modified for various reasons in all the later records.

Therefore we agree with the conclusion of Maclean that in Mark we come much closer to the bed-rock of the gospel story than in either Matthew or Luke,[172] and with the statements of A. B. Bruce: "The realism of Mark makes for its historicity. It is a guarantee of first-hand reports, such as one might expect from Peter. Peter reverences his risen Lord as much as Luke or any other man. But he is one of the men who have been with Jesus, and he speaks from indelible impressions made on his eye and ear, while Luke reports at second hand from written accounts for the most part. . . . Mark is the archaic Gospel, written under the inspiration not of prophecy like Matthew, or of present reverence like Luke, but of fondly cherished past memories.

[171] Compare Allen, Commentary on Matthew, pp. xxxi-xxxiv.

[172] Hastings's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, vol. ii, p. 128.

In it we get nearest to the human personality of Jesus, in all its originality and power, and as colored by the time and place. And the character of Jesus loses nothing by the realistic presentation. Nothing is told which needed to be hid. The homeliest facts reported by the evangelist only increase our interest and our admiration. One who desires to see the Jesus of history truly should con well the pages of Mark first, then pass on to Matthew and Luke." [173]

In closing this study of the second Gospel we could adopt as our own the words of the Dean of Westminster, J. Armitage Robinson. "I hope that in the light of what I have very briefly said you will be encouraged to read the Gospel according to Mark with a fresh interest as the work of a single hand which paints with broad strokes and bright colors the earliest picture we possess of the Saviour of the world." [174]

As the earliest Gospel, written when the facts were yet fresh in Peter's memory; as the Gospel resting upon Peter's authority, the authority of an eyewitness; as the Gospel which seems freest from all philosophical or theological prepossessions, the second Gospel is generally recognized by modern scholars as the most authentic and most authoritative of the evangelical narratives; and in this conclusion the value set upon Mark in the past centuries has been exactly reversed. From being the most neglected and the least valued by New Testament scholars it now ranks before all others as a historical source and a reliable basis for all further study.

VII. The Appendix to the Second Gospel, Mark 16. 9-20

The question concerning these verses is, Did Mark write them or were they written by some other hand? The authorities are arrayed against each other at this point.

[173] Expositor's Greek Testament, vol. i, p. 33.

[174] Robinson, The Study of the Gospels, p. 36.

We make a list of these, and then look at the reasons assigned for their differing positions.

1. The Authorities. The following are among those who believe that these verses were written by Mark: Simon, Mill, Grotius, Bengel, Scrivener, Guericke, Wolf, Wace, Storr, Kuinoel, Kiel, Matthaei, Scholz, Stier, Bisping, Eichhorn, Hug, Schleiermacher, DeWette, Wetstein, Bleek, Olshausen, Lange, Ebrard, Edersheim, Hilgenfeld, Salmon, Wordsworth, McClellan, Bickersteth, Cook, Campbell, Ellicott, Morison, Miller, Burgon. Scrivener says, "We engage to defend the authenticity of this long and important paragraph without the slightest misgiving." [175] Dean Burgon has written a volume on the subject of the genuineness of the closing verses of Mark and his conclusion is, "There is not a particle of doubt, not an atom of suspicion, attaching to the last twelve verses of Mark." On the other hand the genuineness of these verses has been questioned by many, and among them the following authorities: Michaelis, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Schulz, Ritschl, Resch, Zeller, Fritzsche, Credner, Reuss, Wieseler, Klostermann, Hofmann, Holtzmann, Keim, Scholten, Hitzig, Schenkel, Ewald, Meyer, Weiss, Zahn, Abbott, Alford, Davidson, Farrar, Schaff, Swete, Salmond, Thomson, Maclean, Norton, Godet, Lightfoot, Luthardt, Warfield, Westcott and Hort, Gregory, Gould. There are names of able scholars in both of these lists. Why is it that they have not been able to agree in their conclusions as to these verses? The answer to that question opens up a very interesting study in the field of textual and higher criticism. There is evidence for these verses and there is evidence against them, and one must balance probabilities in reaching any issue.

2. The External Evidence in favor of these verses: (1) They are found in most of the uncial manuscripts and in all

[175] Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, Fourth edition, vol. i, p. 337.

of the cursives. In some cursives, however, they are marked as questionable.

(2) They are found in most of the versions, including the Syriac in all forms but one, the Latin in all forms but one, and all the Syriac and Greek lectionaries.

(3) They are quoted by many of the church Fathers, possibly by Hermas, Justin Martyr, and Chrysostom, and certainly by Irenæus, Eusebius, Macarius, Epiphanius, Didymus, Nestorius, Ambrose, Augustine, and the later Latin writers.

3. Other considerations favoring the genuineness of these verses: (1) Without these verses the Gospel would end with the Greek words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, "for they were being afraid." It is extremely improbable that Mark would have closed his book with this note of terror, or with a Greek conjunction. It is sometimes stated that Greek books never end with words of bad omen; but there are some which do, and cases can be cited where the last word is a particle. However, these are very rare indeed, and it would seem next to impossible for Mark to have closed a gospel narrative, the story of the good news concerning Jesus, with these words. Dr. Hort decides that "it is incredible that the evangelist deliberately concluded either a paragraph with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, or the Gospel with a petty detail of a secondary event, leaving his narrative hanging in the air." [176]

(2) If Mark did not close his narrative at 16. 8, he must have written some conclusion of the story which included some account of the resurrection.

(3) It seems beyond belief that Mark should have written a conclusion for this Gospel which was lost and then replaced with another written by some one else, and that this conclusion should then have been accepted everywhere as the genuine writing of Mark.

(4) A very plausible reason has been suggested for the omission of these verses in some manuscripts. We read

[176] Westcott and Hort, Greek Testament, vol. ii, notes, p. 46.

here, "These signs shall accompany them that believe: in my name shall they cast out demons; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them." [177] Macarius Magnes, about A. D. 400, says that the heathen were challenging the Christians with these verses, saying to them: "Are you Christians? Do you believe? Can you show us the signs which accompany those who believe? Can you handle serpents? Can you drink poison and be in no wise hurt by it?" It was difficult to answer such questions. The heathen probably had asked them from the very beginning. It was easier to take those verses out of the Gospel according to Mark than it was to satisfy the questioner either by actual test or plausible argument. This suggestion favors the genuineness of these verses, and simply seeks to account for their omission in some of the authorities.

We turn now to the considerations urged against the genuineness of this appendix to the second Gospel.

4. The External Evidence against these verses: (1) The first and most important fact we meet in this connection is that the two oldest and most authoritative manuscripts of the New Testament do not contain them. In both the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus the Gospel according to Mark ends with 16. 8. The same thing is true of Codex Regius. The symbols of these three codices are Aleph, B, and L. Usually the united testimony of Aleph and B would be regarded as sufficient to decide against the genuineness of any passage in the New Testament not found in them. Some textual critics have thought that their united testimony was weakened in the present case by certain considerations which we will notice later.

(2) These verses are not found in the Lewis palimpsest of the Syriac version, which Eberhard Nestle and J. Rendel Harris think represents the first attempt to translate the Gospel into Syriac, and therefore is older than the Peshito or any

[177] Mark 16. 17, 18.

other Syriac version. These verses also are lacking in one of the manuscripts of the Old Latin version, in one of the Arabic, and in some Armenian and Ethiopian versions. The earliest texts from Carthage, Alexandria, Palestine, and Syria omit these verses; and the only second century evidence for them comes from Italy and Gaul.

(3) Eusebius says that these verses were not in the "accurate copies" of his day.[178] Jerome says they are to be found in few Gospels, "almost all the Greek copies not having it."[179] Victor of Antioch and Gregory of Nyssa bear the same testimony to the fact that the majority of the manuscripts in their day did not have them.

(4) They are not mentioned by Clement of Rome or Clement of Alexandria. However, this fact need not weigh against them, since these writers may have had no clear occasion to quote or use them. Others among the church Fathers we would have expected to deal with these verses, if they had known them, since their extant writings gave them occasion to do so. The argument from silence may be of more weight in their case. Among these we may mention Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret.

(5) These verses are not recognized by the Ammonian sections or the Eusebian canons.

(6) A different, shorter, and spurious ending is found in some manuscripts and versions.

(7) A tenth-century manuscript of the Armenian version has these twelve verses with a heading, stating that they were written by "the elder Ariston." F. C. Conybeare, the discoverer of this manuscript, is convinced that here we have the real author of these verses named. Casper Rene Gregory, Zahn, Resch, and many others are inclined to the same opinion. They identify this Ariston with the Aristion

[178] Ad Marin. Quaest., 1, vol. 4.
[179] Ad Hedib. Qu. 2.

mentioned by Papias. Papias says that Aristion was a disciple of the Lord, from whom he learned many things by questioning him.[180] If Aristion wrote these words, his authority was just as good as that of Mark, and we ought to value this appendix just as highly and print it in our Bibles with Aristion's name attached.

So much for the external evidence against these verses. We turn next to the internal evidence against them; and many scholars think that this is by far weightier than the external evidence is.

5. Internal Evidence against these verses: (1) In 16. 2 we find one phrase for the first day of the week, and in 16. 9 a different one. This may be an indication of a different author.

(2) Verse 9 does not follow well upon verse 8. The subject of the verb in verse 9 cannot be gathered from the immediate context, and surely is not suggested by anything in verse 8. Verse 9 seems, rather, to have been taken from some other context and attached to this.

(3) In verse 9 Mary Magdalene is introduced as a new character. She is described as the woman out of whom Jesus had cast seven devils. Now, Mary Magdalene has been mentioned three times before in the Gospel without this description. Why should this belated identification occur at this point? Mary's name is found in the first verse of this chapter, and Mark felt no necessity of identifying her there. Would he at this place? Is there not an evidence of another hand in this identifying clause?

(4) We are assured that there are eleven words and two phrases in these verses which Mark never uses. The vocabulary is radically different from his. There are three occurrences of the verb *"to go"* in these verses, πορεύομαι, a very common verb in the Greek, but strangely enough it is not found anywhere in the Gospel according to Mark. The demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος, "that," is found five

[180] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., iii, 39.

times in various forms in these verses, and is used as the subject of the verb and in other ways not paralleled anywhere in the Gospel according to Mark or in the other Synoptics. Do these things prove that a new writer with a new vocabulary has written this appendix?

(5) Gould says: "The argument from the general character of the section is stronger still. It is the mere summarizing of the appearances of the Lord. Mark is the most vivid and picturesque of the evangelists. He abbreviates discourses but amplifies narratives. The first eight verses of this chapter are a good example of Mark's style and in striking contrast with the rest of the chapter." [181]

There are other arguments adduced against Mark's authorship of this appendix, but none of them are more conclusive than the ones we have now mentioned, and we may allow them to stand as representative of the list. The differences in style and vocabulary are regarded by most scholars as sufficient to make out a case.

6. Testimony of Aleph and B. These are our two oldest and most valuable manuscripts. Why should not their testimony be considered conclusive against these verses? Salmon has made a very ingenious argument to show that their united testimony is not the testimony of two witnesses at this place, and that on the whole their testimony is not adverse, but, rather, favorable to the genuineness of the appendix. He shows (1) that the same scribe has written the close of the Gospel according to Mark in both these manuscripts. That would be a most extraordinary fact, and it seems almost incredible at first thought. We know nothing about the origin of either of these manuscripts, but we know that the Vatican manuscript has been lying in the Vatican library for many centuries, and we know that the Sinaitic manuscript lay in the Monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai through still longer centuries. The one was the property of the Roman

[181] Commentary on Mark, p. 303.

Catholic Church and the other was the property of the Greek Catholic Church. One was in the continent of Europe and one in the continent of Africa. For more than a thousand years the owners of each were wholly unconscious of the existence of the other. Could it be that the same hand had held them both there in the beginning of the fourth century, that the same hand had written certain of their leaves, and that they afterward had become separated so widely?

When Tischendorf discovered the Sinaitic manuscript near the middle of the last century, the whole world rejoiced that now we had a manuscript of the New Testament of equal antiquity with that in the Vatican library, and that upon the authority of these two manuscripts when they concurred we could be reasonably sure of a reliable text. Tischendorf himself made the discovery that in Aleph the leaf at the close of the Gospel according to Mark was one of six leaves which were different from the leaves of Codex Aleph and were like Codex B. His reasons for so thinking are as follows: (*a*) The shape of certain letters in these six leaves and in Codex B is the same. (*b*) There is the same mode of filling up the space at the end of the line. (*c*) The manner of punctuation is the same. (*d*) The manner of referring to an insertion in the margin is the same. (*e*) The arabesques or ornamental finials are the same. (*f*) The words for "man," "son," and "heaven" are written in full as in B, and not abbreviated as they are elsewhere in Aleph. (*g*) The spelling is the same. On these six leaves Pilate is spelled with "ei," while elsewhere in Aleph it is spelled with "i." John is spelled with one "n," while elsewhere in Aleph it is spelled with two. Tischendorf and Salmon were sure that such an accumulation of indications did not fall short of a demonstration.

Then, if the same man wrote the close of the Gospel according to Mark in both of these most ancient manuscripts, we have no two witnesses against these verses when

this single scribe chose to omit them in both, but the omission rests upon his sole authority. Did the still more ancient manuscripts from which he copied have these verses and did he omit them for some reason of his own unknown to us, or were the verses lacking in his authorities and did he copy his originals faithfully just as they were? It would be interesting to have some light upon this matter, if it could be found in any way.

Salmon thinks that it can be found. He points out the fact that in Aleph the last column of the Gospel according to Mark which is filled from top to bottom has in it only five hundred and sixty letters, while the first column of the Gospel according to Luke has six hundred and seventy-eight letters. Evidently, for some reason the scribe has spread out his writing at the close of Mark so as to fill that last column and have thirty-seven letters to carry over into a new column. If he had not done so, he would have had a whole column blank between the two Gospels at this point. Why did he need to spread out his writing in this fashion in order to get something for this final column? Because, says Salmon, he was evidently leaving out something which had filled this space in the manuscript or manuscripts from which he copied. How about the Vatican manuscript? There *is* a blank column following the close of the Gospel according to Mark in this manuscript, and it is the only blank column in the whole New Testament manuscript! What can the explanation of this blank column be? The scribe must have known that there was something in the original which he chose to leave out.

Therefore Salmon concludes (2) that both the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts, when cross-examined, give evidence, not against, but for the disputed verses, and afford us reason to believe that in this place these manuscripts do not represent the reading of their archetypes, but the critical views of the corrector under whose hand both passed.[182]

[182] Introduction to the New Testament, p. 148.

It does not follow, however, that a blank column bears clear evidence to a conscious omission. In the Vatican manuscript there are two blank columns at the end of Nehemiah and a column and a half left blank at the end of Tobit; and nobody suspects that any of the original contents have been omitted in either of these places. In the Sinaitic manuscript more than two columns and the whole of the next following page are left blank at the end of the Pauline Epistles; and at the end of the book of Acts a column and two thirds with the whole of the next following page. In the Alexandrian manuscript a column and a third are left blank at the end of Mark, although it has the appendix, 16. 9-20, in full. No one argues that the scribe has consciously omitted something additional, because of this blank. In this manuscript half a page is also left blank at the end of John and a whole page at the end of the Pauline Epistles. These facts show that leaving a blank at the end of a book and the size of the blank were matters lying wholly at the will of the copyist, and therefore we cannot argue with any certainty that the blanks in either Aleph or B prove that their scribe knew of any other ending than that he has given us.

7. If we decide either upon the external or the internal evidence that these closing verses were not written by Mark, how can we explain the abrupt ending of the second Gospel? Why did not Mark write some account of the resurrection appearances and of the ascension of the Lord? Several suggestions have been made. They are, of course, nothing but guesses in the dark. They represent possibilities and nothing more.

(1) Michaelis, Hug, and others have thought that Mark was interrupted when he had written 16. 8 by Peter's imprisonment or martyrdom, or by his own sickness, or by some accident. Godet thinks that Mark fled from Rome at the time of the unexpected outbreak of the Neronian persecution and that he left this Gospel behind him unfinished. However, if the church tradition is a true one, and Mark

lived long years afterward in Alexandria, it would seem most improbable that he never would have seen this manuscript again and never would have thought it worth while to complete the gospel story. We think he must have done so at some time.

(2) Griesbach, Schulthess, Schulz, and others have suggested that in some way the closing leaf or leaves of the original Gospel according to Mark were lost after the death of Mark and that the manuscript as it was preserved closed at the bottom of a page with 16. 8. Later some one tried to supply the omission with an ending written by himself and embodying the second century tradition concerning the matters he mentioned. This seems more likely than the former hypothesis that Mark never wrote any ending for the Gospel. However, it seems strange that no copies had been made of the original by Mark before it was allowed to fall into such a dilapidated state, and that no tradition was preserved of the original contents in its verbal accuracy. It lies within the range of possibility that some modern excavator in Egypt will dig up out of the desert sands for us the autograph copy of the original ending as written by Mark! It is a consummation devoutly to be desired.

8. Conclusions. (1) The genuineness of these twelve closing verses is to be seriously doubted. The differences in style and vocabulary and other minor phenomena are sufficient to raise very serious questions as to the possibility of their authorship by Mark. Our oldest manuscripts and our oldest version omit them.

(2) They may have been written by Aristion, but we cannot be sure of it. In any case, the appendix must be very ancient and it represents the apostolic tradition of the second century.

(3) Until the genuine ending by Mark has been discovered, this appendix ought to be printed in our Bibles with a space between it and the Gospel or a note attached declaring its doubtful authenticity.

PART III

"THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN": THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

PART III

"THE MOST BEAUTIFUL BOOK EVER WRITTEN": THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

I. THE AUTHOR

1. The New Testament Data

The Gospel according to Luke has been said by Renan to be "the most beautiful book ever written."[1] A beautiful book is in all probability the product of a beautiful soul. The most beautiful book ever written, especially since it deals with spiritual themes and is the story of The Perfect Life, must have had an author worthy of our most intimate acquaintance, a man of noble soul and adequate training, interesting to us in every detail of his career and in every phase of his character.

We would like to know all about Homer and all about Shakespeare, or at least as much as we know about Martin Luther and John Wesley; but the multitude of details concerning the private and the public life of Luther and Wesley utterly fail us when we come to these greatest geniuses of our literature. We know comparatively little about the personal life of Homer or of Shakespeare, and we know comparatively little about the author of this "most beautiful book ever written." Jesus we know, and Peter we know, and John we know, and Paul we know, and we know something of most of the twelve apostles and of many of the deacons and evangelists of the early church; and we owe most of our knowledge of these men to the evangelist Luke. We owe more of it to him than to any other man who ever

[1] Renan, Les Evangiles, p. 283, "C'est le plus beau livre qu'il y ait."

lived or wrote about them. But Luke tells us little or nothing about himself. He never mentions his own name either in the Gospel or in the book of Acts. He makes one reference to himself in the use of the personal pronoun in the preface to the Gospel, "It seemed good to *me* also to write,"[2] and the use of the plural pronouns "we" and "us" in the book of Acts has been generally supposed to indicate the entrance of Luke himself upon the scene.

Luke's name, however, appears only three times in the New Testament: in Philem. 24, "Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow workers" salute you; Col. 4. 14, "Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas salute you," and 2 Tim. 4. 10, 11, where after declaring, "Demas forsook me, having loved this present world," Paul adds, "Only Luke is with me." We notice that in each of these three passages Luke and Demas are mentioned together, Demas being a fellow worker in the first two passages, but having forsaken Paul in the last of them, while Luke alone remained faithful and present with him. It is also worth noticing that in the immediate context of each of these passages the name of the other evangelist and author of a Gospel narrative who was not an apostle occurs. Mark is mentioned in Philem. 24; Col. 4. 10; and 2 Tim. 4. 11.

Upon the basis of these three passages in which his name occurs what facts may we glean concerning the author of the most beautiful book in all literature?

2. The Name "Luke"

We begin with the name itself. (1) "Luke," in the Greek, Λουκᾶς, is a very uncommon name. We are told that it is not to be found in the writings of any classical author or upon any Greek or Latin inscription, and that it does not occur before New Testament times. It is a peculiar name, distinctive by its very strangeness and infrequency. It

[2] Luke 1. 3.

seems to be a contracted or shortened form of "Lucanus," in the Greek Λουκανός (which is found in inscriptions), as "Apollos" was a shortened form of "Apollonius," and "Silas" of "Silvanus."[3] These three men, Lucas, Apollos, and Silas, were all friends of the apostle Paul, and in their ministry with him they must have been thrown into intimate association with each other; and they all had nicknames, or, rather, shortened and abbreviated names by which they were called in preference to the full name, which was too long for common or familiar use.[4] In the earliest copies of the Latin Bible the name "Lucanus" frequently occurs in the title of the Gospel, "Cata Lucanum."

(2) Dean Plumptre has called attention to the fact that the only other noted man of this immediate period in history who bore the name "Lucanus" was the Latin poet, the author of the "Pharsalia," the epic poem which set forth the struggle between Julius Cæsar and Pompey for the supreme power at Rome.[5] Now, this Lucanus was born in the year A. D. 39, and therefore he was probably thirty or forty years younger than our Luke, the author of the third Gospel. Dean Plumptre has made this further most interesting suggestion: that it is just possible that the poet Lucanus was named after the physician Luke. If Luke were a beloved physician in the family when the boy Lucanus was born, the father and mother may have decided to show their ap-

---

[3] Ramsay and Deissmann are convinced by recent discoveries of inscriptions in Asia Minor that Λουκᾶς is the equivalent of Λούκιος, which corresponds to the Latin name "Lucius." See Ramsay, The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, chap. xxv.

[4] Other examples are: "Amplias" for "Ampliatus" (Rom. 16. 8), "Olympas" for "Olympiodorus" (Rom. 16. 15), "Demas" for "Demetrius" (Col. 4. 14), "Epaphras" for "Epaphroditus" (Col. 4. 12), "Zenas" for "Zenodorus" (Titus 3. 13), "Antipas" for "Antipatris" (Rev. 2. 13), "Stephanas" for "Stephanephorus" (1 Cor. 16. 15). See Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, ii, p. 83.

[5] Books of the Bible. New Testament, pp. 74, 75.

preciation of him and his services by naming the child after him. Every physician is likely to have namesakes, given him in just this way.

Is there any good reason for supposing that there was any personal relation between these two Lukes in this period of history? Yes, for if Luke the physician and Lucanus the poet were lifelong friends, and the physician was on intimate and trusted terms of familiarity with the poet's family, then Luke would be sure to make them acquainted with his beloved master, Paul, and through Luke they would be sure to hear about and to become more or less interested in Paul's preaching and Paul's apostolic career. Have we any indications of any such acquaintanceship with or interest in Paul on the part of any members of the family of Lucanus?

a. In the eighteenth chapter of Acts we read that the Jews in Corinth seized the apostle Paul and brought him before the proconsul of Achaia, whose name was Gallio, and charged him with persuading men to worship God contrary to the law. When Paul was about to make answer to that charge Gallio interrupted him and told the Jews that if Paul had been guilty of any criminal behavior he would try him; but if he were simply preaching a new form of Jewish doctrine, that was a matter upon which he did not choose to sit in judgment. Then he drove them from the judgment seat, and they were a most disappointed and angry set of men.[6] They had expected Gallio to put Paul in prison or to stop his evangelistic work in one way or another. They found him seemingly favorable to the prisoner and indisposed to interfere in any way with his mission and teaching. What was the explanation of this indifference to the complaints of the Jews and this willingness to befriend their prisoner, Paul? This Gallio was the uncle of Lucanus the poet. Had Luke the evangelist told Luke the poet all about Paul and his work, and had Luke the poet told his

[6] Acts 18. 12-17.

uncle Gallio enough of these things to prejudice him in Paul's favor? That would seem to be possible at least.

b. Then in the time of Augustine and Jerome fourteen letters were extant which were supposed to have passed between the Latin philosopher Seneca and the apostle Paul. Those which have come down to our day have been pronounced spurious, but at that time they were believed to be genuine, and that very belief bore witness to the fact that there was a widespread tradition in the early church that there had been some personal acquaintance and intercourse between Seneca and Paul. Seneca was an official in the court of Nero while Paul was a prisoner at Rome. We read that Paul's Gospel became known through the whole Prætorian guard,[7] and that certain members of Cæsar's household were converted,[8] and it is altogether probable that Seneca would hear about these things and would be interested to talk with such a man as Paul had proved himself to be.

Bishop Lightfoot has written an essay on Saint Paul and Seneca,[9] in which he has made a most interesting collection of the coincidences in thought and in language to be found in the extant and genuine writings of these two men; and if these coincidences are not sufficient to prove that the two men knew each other and were acquainted with each other's views, they go very far, at least, toward making that supposition probable. Now, Seneca was another uncle of Lucanus the poet. If Luke the evangelist was on terms of intimacy with the members of this family, we could find in that fact an explanation of the actual friendliness of Gallio and of the traditional friendship of Seneca for the apostle Paul. The name of the evangelist Luke, then, uncommon as it is, and having only one parallel in the history of this time, may furnish a suggestive link with the family

[7] Phil. 1. 13.
[8] Phil. 4. 22.
[9] Commentary on Philippians, pp. 270-333.

of the poet Lucanus and so help us to explain the recorded and traditional relations between certain members of this family and the apostle Paul.

3. Luke, the Companion of Paul

We turn back to the three passages in which Luke's name occurs and we find that they all bear witness to another fact concerning him, namely, that he was for a part of his life, at least, the close companion of the apostle Paul. (1) We have noticed that at certain points in the narrative of the book of Acts the pronoun "we" occurs. It is understood usually that this pronoun marks the entrance of Luke himself upon the scene. If so, Paul finds Luke at Troas and takes him, with Timothy and Silas, into Macedonia on the first foreign missionary journey from the continent of Asia into the continent of Europe.[10] Here Paul seems to have left Luke in charge of the church at Philippi, since the pronoun "they" takes the place of the pronoun "we" in Acts 17. 1 and the narrative following. This was in A. D. 51. Seven years later, in A. D. 58, Paul finds Luke again here at Philippi,[11] and Luke goes with Paul on his journey to Jerusalem.[12] He was with Paul at the time of his arrest and went with him to Cæsarea. He remained with him during the two years of the Cæsarean imprisonment and accompanied him on the voyage to Rome. At the close of the narrative of the book of Acts Luke is still with Paul; and from 2 Tim. 4. 11 we learn that he was Paul's sole remaining companion at the time of the writing of that epistle. He probably stayed at his master's side to the day of Paul's martyrdom.

Are there any other Scriptures, except these passages in which his name occurs or the pronoun "we" discloses his presence, in which we may have any glimpse of Luke's min-

[10] Acts 16. 10. This was the second missionary journey of Paul.
[11] Acts 20. 5, 6.
[12] Acts 21. 15-18.

istry? (2) It has been suggested by Epiphanius[13] that Luke was one of the seventy sent out by our Lord as the forerunners in his village ministry.[14] Probably the only reason for such a suggestion is that Luke is the only one of the synoptics who has made any extended record of this evangelistic tour.

(3) Theophylact[15] thought that Luke was the unnamed companion of Cleopas in his walk to Emmaus on the resurrection day. This narrative too is peculiar to the third Gospel; but if Luke were a Gentile, as we shall have reason to conclude, that fact would rule out either of these possibilities. The seventy were, of course, all Jews; and the companion of Cleopas and resident of his home was a Jewess or a Jew.

(4) It has been conjectured that Luke was one of the Greeks who asked to be introduced to Jesus at the time of the last feast in Jerusalem,[16] but even this suggestion does not seem to come within the realm of possibility, for Luke declares in the preface to his Gospel that he is about to record what eyewitnesses had reported to him, and thus clearly places himself among those who were wholly dependent upon tradition for what they knew of the gospel story. If he had been an eyewitness himself at any point, he surely would have claimed firsthand authority for his narrative in that place. He makes no such claim. We conclude, therefore, that he belonged to the second generation of believers and that he himself never saw Jesus.

(5) However, in 2 Cor. 8. 18, 19, Paul speaks of some brother whose praise in the gospel was spread through all the churches and who had been appointed by the churches to travel with him, collecting money for the poor saints in Jerusalem. This unnamed brother may have been Luke.

---

[13] Bishop of Salamis, in Cyprus, Adv. Haer., 377 A. D.

[14] Luke 10. 1-20.

[15] Archbishop of Albanians and Bulgarians, 1077 A. D.

[16] John 12. 20.

He traveled with Paul on so many other occasions, and he went with Paul when this collection was finally carried to Jerusalem. If he had labored in its gathering, he deserved to have some share in its distribution; or he may have been intrusted to see it safely to its destination. Anyway, we are sure from our Scriptures that Luke was the close and congenial companion of the apostle Paul.

They must have liked each other, because they were like spirits. They were both educated men, with scholarly habits and with literary and cultured tastes. They were great-hearted, liberal-minded, broad-spirited. They must have influenced and strengthened each other in the development of their natural tendencies. They probably were about the same age, and they must have been drawn to each other from their first meeting, and their continued and lifelong friendship proved their perfect congeniality. Philip Schaff thinks that they were foreordained to be comrades,[17] and he points out other notable friendships in church history, at the time of the Reformation between Luther and Melanchthon, Zwingli and Œcolampadius, Calvin and Beza, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; and in the eighteenth century between the two Wesleys and Whitefield; and then in this same apostolic period between Peter and Mark. The Master sent out the apostles in the beginning two by two; and this recognized necessity for companionship and encouragement in the formative period of the church has manifested itself in all the great creative periods in church history since that time.

No one ever will be able to estimate how much service to the cause of Christ these congenial companionships between Christian colaborers have been. It may be that we owe to them the very existence of two of our four Gospels. Two of these Gospels were written by apostles—that according to Matthew and that according to John. The other two were written by the two congenial companions of

[17] History of the Christian Church, vol. i, p. 649.

the two greatest apostles, Peter and Paul. It is usually supposed that Mark's record of the life of Jesus was the first to be written, and that it was in some sense a summary of the teaching and preaching of Peter, whose interpreter and companion and "son" in the gospel Mark was.[18] Peter and Mark were both men of sanguine temperament. They were both men of restless energy, ready to jump at conclusions rather than to take time to reason them out. They were both liable to make mistakes, and they were both ready to repent as soon as they realized that a mistake had been made. Paul never could have endured steady companionship with a man like John Mark. He would rather part company with Barnabas than keep company with him.[19] But Peter and Mark were a congenial pair, and the Gospel record written by Mark represents these two men in its general characteristics, brief, energetic, full of action, and unliterary as it is. On the contrary, the Gospel written by Luke is the longest and the most literary of the Gospels. It was the product of the cultured and congenial companion of the apostle Paul. Possibly, however, there was a still better or more imperative reason than mere personal pleasure in comradeship to account for the close connection existing for years between the apostle Paul and his traveling companion, Luke.

4. Luke, the Physician

We turn again to Col. 4. 14 and we find that Paul not only calls Luke "beloved," but his "beloved physician," and we recall that just before Luke joined Paul at Troas in that first missionary advance into the continent of Europe Paul had been suffering from some infirmity of the flesh in Galatia,[20] and it may well have been that he was dreading a recurrence of that experience and asked Luke to go along

[18] 1 Pet. 5. 13.
[19] Acts 15. 37-40.
[20] Gal. 4. 13.

with him to help to ward it off or to care for him if he were again disabled by it. We recall also that when Luke rejoins Paul at Philippi and accompanies him on the last voyage to Jerusalem it is just after Paul has been suffering again from an affliction in which he had even despaired of his life.[21] From this time on Luke remains constantly at his side. Paul doubtless needed the continuous attention of a physician during these closing years of his life.

Luke was an attendant physician, but, more than that, he was Paul's beloved companion and friend. That fact throws a deal of light upon his character and goes far to make him a model for all men in his profession. Luke must have been thoroughly competent, or Paul would not have trusted him. We want the men into whose hands we put the preservation of our lives to have the best education which the schools can furnish them and plenty of practical experience before they begin to make any experiments upon us. Now, the best medical education in Paul's day was to be found among the Greeks, and all of the great medical authorities among the Greeks whose works are extant were Greeks of Asia Minor. Hippocrates can scarcely be called an exception, for he was born and lived on the island of Cos, off the coast of Caria. Galen came from Pergamus in Mysia, Dioscorides from Anazarba in Cilicia, and Aretæus from Cappadocia. These were the great masters in the medical profession, and they were all Asiatic Greeks.

The great university in Asia Minor in Luke's day was situated at Tarsus, which was the home of Paul. There was no other place in Asia Minor or in the world of that day where Luke could get as good a medical education as he could at Tarsus. If he went to school there, he may have met Paul either in the university or on the streets of that city; and if they became schoolboy friends and discovered their congeniality of spirit in those early days before either of them had been converted to the Christian faith, it would

[21] 2 Cor. 1. 9.

go far to explain their immediate union of fortunes and communion of interests when they met in after years at Troas. Paul knew that Luke was a thoroughly educated and competent physician and was willing to trust the treatment of his case in his hands without any hesitation. If he had known Luke in Tarsus in early youth, and had known all about his university training there, at Troas he would learn all about Luke's experience as a physician in the long years which had elapsed since those university days.

It has been suggested that Luke must have practiced medicine, for a time at least, on one of the vessels plying up and down the Mediterranean, since he shows such an accurate acquaintance with technical nautical terms in his description of the voyage and the shipwreck in the twenty-seventh chapter of the book of Acts. We already have found reason to suppose that he may have been the trusted physician in the family of Lucanus the poet, and so have come into contact with such men as Gallio and Seneca. He may have been the physician as well as the friend of Theophilus, the man for whom he wrote his two volumes of history; and this Theophilus must have been a man of influence and prominence in the Christian Church of the early days. We shall see later that Luke may have had confidential relations as physician with certain members of the royal court in Palestine. All the indications agree in leading us to the conclusion that Luke had had a varied and an unusually successful career as a physician after leaving school and before joining Paul at Troas.

He had had most excellent training in the beginning, and now he had years of experience behind him. He was no longer young and untried. Paul was more ready to trust him on that account.

Luke was a Greek, of the race of Æsculapius and Hippocrates. He had the Greek gift of a joyous disposition, a pleasant manner, a lovable personality. He was the beloved physician because of his personal character. Paul

loved him, however, not only because he was a trained and trusted and agreeable physician, but also because he was a Christian, a missionary, an evangelist. His praise was in all the churches for his good work in all these fields. He was beloved for his medical skill and for his ever aggressive and ever attractive Christianity. He might well be a model for all in the medical profession. There is a Latin stanza which appraises his worth in this twofold capacity as follows:

"Lucas, Evangelii et medicinæ munera pandens;
Artibus hinc, illinc religione, valet:
Utilis ille labor, per quem vixere tot ægri;
Utilior, per quem tot didicere mori!" [22]

5. Luke, the Musician

Have we now the complete picture of Luke the beloved physician as far as the Scriptures can help us to form one? Are there any other personal characteristics of which they make us reasonably sure? When we turn to Luke's own writings I think they will testify to at least one more feature of Luke's equipment as a physician and as an evangelist.

He was a man who was fond of music. He is the first great Christian hymnologist. He has preserved for us five great hymns of the early church. He is the only evangelist who has done that. His gospel narrative begins with hymns and ends with praises. Now, music and medicine always go well together and singing and salvation always have gone hand in hand.

The Old Testament was full of singing and it has a hymn book in its heart. Luke believed that those Old Testament hymns could be adapted to Christian uses. He carries the hymnology of the Old Testament church over into the New. He is the father and the founder of Christian hymnology. Bishop Keble says of Luke:

---

[22] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 648.

"Thou hast an ear for angel songs,
A breath the gospel trump to fill,
And taught by thee the church prolongs,
Her hymns of high thanksgiving still."

He shows us how the very beginning of the Christian era was ushered in with songs, and how the Christian Church sang its way through its earliest triumphs. When Paul and Silas had been cast into the inner prison and their feet were made fast in the stocks, at midnight they sang praises unto God until an earthquake opened their prison doors and everyone's bands were loosed. We often have wondered if those hymns which Paul and Silas sang were not composed by Luke. Timothy and Luke were with Paul and Silas there at Philippi. They may have been keeping their midnight vigil just outside the prison walls, and when they heard the prisoners singing some of Luke's gospel hymns they knew that imprisonment had not daunted the spirits of those apostles of God's grace.

Luke was full of music himself. He collected and recorded the first Christian hymns. He gave Paul medicine when he needed it, and when all medicines had failed, like another David before another Saul, he ministered to him in melody until his physical ills and his spiritual wounds were all healed. He must have been a versatile genius, this man Luke, ready to serve and able to serve according to any man's need. No wonder that he was beloved by all, and his praise was in all the churches.

6. Luke, the Artist

From church tradition we may add another accomplishment to this many-sided man. Dante Gabriel Rossetti has put this church tradition into his lines:

"Give honor unto Luke, evangelist,
For he it was, the ancient legends say,
Who first taught Art to fold her hands and pray."[28]

[28] Sonnet lxxiv. In the House of Life.

Luke was said to have painted the portrait of the Virgin.[24] The oldest witness to this fact is Theodorus Lector, who was reader in the Church of Constantinople in the sixth century. He tells us that the Empress Eudoxia found at Jerusalem a picture of the God-Mother painted by Luke the apostle and she presented it to her daughter, Pulcheria, the wife of Theodosius II, about 440 A. D. In the Capella Paolina, in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, at Rome, a very ancient picture is preserved, a portrait of the Virgin ascribed to Luke. It can be traced back to A. D. 847, and it may be much older than that.

In the catacombs there is an inscription referring to a rude painting of the Virgin as "one of seven painted by Luca." This inscription may be the source of the later traditions. Or they may all have sprung from the fact that, as Plummer says: "Luke has had a great influence upon Christian art, of which in a real sense he may be called the founder. 'The Shepherd with the Lost Sheep on His Shoulder,' one of the earliest representations of Christ, comes from Luke 15; and both mediæval and modern artists have been specially fond of representing those scenes which are described by Luke alone: the annunciation, the visit of Mary to Elisabeth, the shepherds, the manger, the presentation in the temple, Simeon and Anna, Christ with the doctors, the woman at the supper of Simon the Pharisee, Christ weeping over Jerusalem, the walk to Emmaus, the good Samaritan, the prodigal son. Many other scenes which are favorites with painters might be added from the Acts." [25] Luke, says Philip Schaff, "is the painter of Christus Salvator and Christus Consolator." [26]

He may not have been an artist with his brush, but we know that he was an artist with his pen. He composed a book which a competent critic declares to be the most beauti-

[24] Plummer, International Critical Commentary on Luke, p. xxii.
[25] Plummer, *op.cit.*, p. xxii.
[26] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 660.

ful book ever written. In it he has portrayed the Virgin Mary and her Sinless Son and many other characters most beautiful and rare. He had an artist's soul. He loved the good and beautiful and true. He may have used the artist's tools. It would make him a very versatile genius indeed, if he were a competent physician and an accomplished musician and a painter of pictures besides. But we have known just such versatile men again and again in the course of the centuries. Luke may have been one of them. We know that he was an extraordinary man in many respects; and we know that if he never put any portraits on canvas, he has put them on his written page with such artistic excellence that he may safely be said to be the founder of Christian art.

7. Luke, the Gentile

We have suggested that Luke was in all probability a Gentile. Our reasons for so concluding are not absolutely compelling ones. They seem to establish the dominant probability in the case. They are as follows: (1) Luke's name is Greek.

(2) His style is more like that of a Greek than a Jew. Philip Schaff declares that his writing is admirably suited to the Greek taste, and that the prologue to the Gospel would at once captivate the refined Hellenic ear by its classic construction. He compares it with the prologues of Herodotus and Thucydides and concludes that Luke's prologue is unsurpassed for brevity, modesty, and dignity.[27] Of no other writer in the New Testament could such statements be made; and the easy conclusion is that Luke could write so much better Greek because he himself was a Greek.

(3) In Col. 4. 10-14 Paul sends the salutations of Aristarchus, Mark, and Jesus Justus to the Colossians; and he says of them, "These are of the circumcision." Then he goes on to send the salutations of Epaphras, Luke, and Demas, as if these were not included among those of the circumci-

[27] Schaff. *op. cit.*, pp. 656, 664.

sion whose salutations he sent first. If we could be sure that there was an intentional distinction here, as there certainly seems to be, it would settle the matter that Luke was indeed a Gentile by birth. If we so conclude, we have in Luke the only Gentile among the writers of the New Testament books. It would be interesting if we could decide not only that Luke was a Gentile, but also to what part of the Gentile world he belonged.

8. Luke, Citizen of Antioch

All indications seem to point to Antioch of Syria as his home. We list a few of these: (1) Eusebius[28] says that Luke belonged to an Antiochian family.

(2) Jerome[29] tells us explicitly that Luke was a physician of Antioch, and a preface to the Gospel, written, as Harnack thinks, in the third century, says that Luke was by nation a Syrian of Antioch.

(3) In the book of Acts Luke names the seven deacons appointed over the church of Jerusalem and locates only one of them, and he is "Nicolas of Antioch."[30] Why was Nicolas given this location? Was it because Luke had known him at Antioch and was proud of the fact that one of his fellow citizens had been appointed to such an office, and therefore considered it well worth his recording? James Smith points out the coincidence that of eight accounts of the Russian campaign of 1812, three written by Frenchmen and three written by Englishmen never mention the fact that the Russian General Barclay de Tolly was of Scotch extraction; but the two accounts of that campaign written by the two Scotchmen, Scott and Alison, both mention it. It was of more importance to them; at least it was of sufficient importance to seem to them to be well worth chronicling.

(4) Luke seems to be well acquainted with the history

[28] Ecclesiastical History, iii, 4, 7.
[29] De Viris Illustribus, vii.
[30] Acts 6. 5.

of the church at Antioch and gives us an unusually full account of its pastors and teachers and their enterprises and their trials. He makes the church at Antioch the mother of all the Gentile churches; and he says that the Christians were first called by that name in Antioch. Luke seems to be well acquainted with all the controversies in the church in this city. It is to Antioch that Barnabas summons Saul, and in their labors together in the synagogues of Antioch they are made ready for their advance upon the Gentile world. It is from Antioch that Barnabas and Saul are sent forth to their great missionary campaigns; and it is to Antioch that they return to make their reports. Such records as we find in Acts 11. 19-30, and 13. 1-3, and 15. 1-3, 30-40 lead us to suppose that Luke must have been resident in Antioch and that he was personally acquainted with the events which he has narrated at such comparatively unusual length.

(5) There is a reading peculiar to Codex Bezæ, which was known to Augustine, and which was accepted by him as genuine and of good authority, and which would go far to settle this probability of Luke's residence in Antioch if we adopted it, for it would represent the first occurrence of the pronoun "we" in the narrative and would locate the narrator in Antioch. After Acts 11. 27, which reads, "Now in these days there came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch," Codex Bezæ has the following statement: "And there was great rejoicing; and when we were gathered together one of them named Agabus stood up," and so on. According to this reading, Luke was a member of the church at Antioch at this time. If so, Luke probably was among the very first Gentile converts to Christianity in Antioch. He was one of the Hellenists converted before Barnabas or Paul had reached Antioch, and we can imagine how heartily he would have welcomed his old school friend and how cordially their association in Christian work would have begun at this time and place.

(6) There is still another indication of Luke's connection with Antioch. He dedicates both his books to the "most honorable Theophilus." Now, the Clementines tell us that Theophilus was a wealthy citizen of Antioch. He probably held some official position there. The title which Luke gives him is the title given to the governors Felix and Festus in the book of Acts,[31] and it may be reserved for those who are employed in the government service, and for these alone. Then the better translation of the title would be, "most honorable" or "most noble." This Theophilus was a wealthy man and a Christian man, and it may be that he was Luke's literary patron and furnished him the leisure and the financial backing necessary for the publication of his two volumes of history.

9. Luke, the Freedman

Some have thought that Luke was a freedman. The reasons suggested for such a conclusion are: (1) It was a custom among both the Greeks and the Romans to educate some one of their domestic slaves in the medical profession, and if he proved expert in it, it was not an unusual thing for them to grant him his freedom in return for his services. A large number of the physicians of that day are said to have belonged to this class.

(2) Such names as Luke's, contractions in *as*, as "Lucas" for "Lucanus," we are told, were peculiarly common in the names of slaves. Luke was a man of broad sympathies for all the down-trodden and the poor, as his writings well show. Did he learn this sympathy for all the wretched ones when he was a slave, and in all his after life of freedom did he never lose his memory of their need? And was it therefore one of his chief delights in the gospel that in his conception of it its first and chief mission was to preach good tidings to

[31] Acts 23. 26; 24. 3; 26. 25.

the poor, to proclaim release to the captives, and to set at liberty them that are bruised?[32]

If Luke began life as a slave, he must have made the most of all the opportunities offered him, and very early in life he must have proved himself worthy of freedom; and in his later life, with his scientific and professional training, he was a worthy and beloved associate of those other university graduates, Paul and Apollos, and possibly Barnabas. Of all the first preachers of the gospel these alone would seem to have had the advantages of the schools, and most naturally they drifted together and found the greatest pleasure in each other's congenial companionship. College men are birds of a feather, and, unless there be some personal reason to the contrary, they are sure to flock together; and if they do so, their service to any cause they may espouse is usually found to be the most efficient service it can muster.

Barnabas was the great reconciler in the infant church. Apollos was the great orator; and if he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, he added the finest literary composition to the books of the New Testament. Paul was the church organizer and pioneer missionary and systematic theologian without a peer. Luke was the author of the most beautiful book ever written and the incomparable historian of the early church. It would seem that Christianity could not have gotten along very well in the beginning without these four college men, as it has not been able to get along very well at any time since without the leadership of men of the highest education. Three of these men, Barnabas, Paul, and Luke, possibly met each other for the first time in the University of Tarsus; and their friendship formed in college may have had much to do with the shaping of their future lives. Apollos came from the rival school at Alexandria; but when he became a Christian he was admitted to their circle without question as a man of culture and refinement,

---

[32] Luke 4. 18.

and therefore sure to furnish serviceable and congenial companionship.

10. Luke in Later Tradition

The later church traditions concerning Luke do not date farther back than the fourth century, A. D. Epiphanius tells us that after Paul's death Luke preached in Italy and in Gaul and in Dalmatia and in Macedonia.[33] We are told that he lived to the age of seventy-four or eighty-four. One account says that he was finally crucified in the Peloponnesus, at Eleæa, on an olive tree. Another account says that he died a natural death in Bithynia. Later we read that his bones were brought from Patras in Achaia by the order of the emperor Constantine and were buried in the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, in 357 A. D.

11. An Outline Biography

We have now before us all the facts and all the inferences and traditions out of which it might be possible to construct an ideal biography of the evangelist Luke. Shall we make the attempt to outline his career upon the basis of these? We shall remember all the cautions suggested by Zahn when he says: "The imagination has a place in historical science only in so far as it serves to set in a clear light the possibility and probability of the presuppositions which are demanded by the actual facts. Nor has the imagination any rights over against a tradition, be this as meager as it may, until it is shown that the latter is without basis in fact, and therefore false. Finally, the imagination must guard itself carefully against postulates which have possible support only in the narrow experience of scholars whose vision is bounded by the four walls of a study."[34] Within these legitimate limits and availing ourselves of the material in hand we suggest the following particulars:

[33] Haer. 51.

[34] Zahn, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 376.

1. Luke was born a slave boy in the household of Theophilus, a wealthy government official in Antioch. He grew up into most engaging appearance and most attractive personality. He was of a peculiarly acute intellect and of a most obliging disposition. He won his master's confidence and then his personal liking. Theophilus decided to educate the boy at his own expense and at the best university in the land. So it was that the second capital event in the life of Luke was his matriculation at Tarsus.

2. Here he studied medicine, where the great masters in that profession, Aretæus, Dioscorides, and Athenæus, had been educated. Just a few miles away at Ægæ stood the great Temple of Æsculapius, which furnished the nearest approach to the modern hospital to be found in the ancient world. From the university lectures Luke got the theory of medicine; in the Temple of Æsculapius he got the practice and experience he needed. He made the acquaintance of Barnabas and Saul here, and laid the foundations for a lifelong friendship with these men.

3. His education completed, he returned to Antioch and rendered faithful and most successful service in his master's family. Then the gospel was preached at Antioch by men of Cyprus and Cyrene, fleeing from the persecution in Jerusalem; and Luke was among the first to hear it and to accept it. He told his master, Theophilus, about it, and Theophilus himself became interested and at last converted. Then about the first thing Theophilus did as a Christian was to give Luke his freedom.

4. The first impulse of the freedman Luke was to get away from all the scenes of his servitude and to test his new-found liberty by wandering far and wide at his own sweet will. He shipped as a physician upon one of the vessels plying up and down the Mediterranean, and there he had manifold experiences. His outlook was broadened as he saw more of the world. He was of service to many people and he made many friends.

5. On one of his voyages he met some members of the family of Lucanus, the poet, and they persuaded him to accompany them to their home in Corduba in Spain. Luke was there when the poet was born, and the baby boy was named after him. In this household he became acquainted with Gallio and Seneca and many other notable men. The slave boy had risen to a considerable height, for his natural ability and his excellent education and his goodness of heart enabled him to converse with the best of men as their equal, and as a freedman and physician he was admitted to terms of intimacy which otherwise would have been impossible.

6. In due time he came back to Antioch and was resident there when many of the stirring events which he narrates in the history of its Christian Church took place.

7. Later he removed to Troas and settled there, where Paul found him on his second missionary journey. He went with Paul to Philippi, and was left in charge of the church in that city for seven years.

8. He left Philippi with Paul in A. D. 58, and remained with Paul thereafter until the apostle's martyrdom.

9. Some time after this event he wrote the third Gospel and the book of Acts for Theophilus, and he fully intended to write a third volume continuing the history, but he was swept away into the tide of Christian evangelism and never found the leisure to do it.

10. He labored as an evangelist in many lands, and in a ripe old age he fell on sleep and was buried somewhere in Greece.

11. Luke was one of the most respected and best-beloved members of the early church. His praise was in all the churches. All women liked him and all men honored him. Apollos and he were the most accomplished writers, and Paul and he were the most prolific writers of the New Testament times. Take the writings of Luke and Paul out of the New Testament and it would be less than half its present size; and of the larger half of the present con-

tents of the New Testament Luke wrote more than Paul. He was a most versatile man—a physician, a musician, a painter, a poet, a preacher, a prolific author, an intrepid missionary—a man with many gifts and many friends and manifold accomplishment. His biography was a romance. His books are invaluable. Both he and they are worth our knowing and knowing well.

II. Sources of the Gospel

Luke was not an eyewitness of the events in the gospel history. Where did he get his information concerning these things he has recorded? We turn to the beginning words of the Gospel to find what he himself has to say about it. We find that Luke appeals both to documentary authorities and to personal witnesses,[35] and we ask, 1, What were Luke's documents?

We think we can distinguish a few of them. (1) After the introduction explaining the authority and the aims of the book, the first two chapters of the third Gospel are full of Hebraic expressions and differ so widely in style and general character from the remainder of the Gospel that almost all scholars have concluded that they are translations from the Aramaic, and probably represent two or three written sources. We may find the conclusions of these fragments at 1. 80; 2. 40; and 2. 52.

(2) The genealogy in 3. 23-38 must have been taken, of course, from some legal or tribal or temple document.

(3) It does not seem probable that Luke was acquainted with our Gospel according to Matthew either in the Greek or in the Hebrew. It is possible that he did not know the Gospel according to Mark in its present form. We know, however, that Mark was at Rome with Paul in A. D. 64, according to Col. 4. 10 and Philem. 24. We know, further, that Luke was there at the same time.[36] When we notice,

[35] Luke 1. 1-4.

[36] Col. 4. 14.

therefore, that there are certain portions of Luke's narrative which are paralleled in Mark's account and which are not to be found in the Gospel according to Matthew, the most natural and adequate explanation of these parallels between Mark and Luke would be found in the personal association of these two men at Rome, where they could compare notes of material already collected. Of these passages in Luke, not to be found in Matthew, but paralleled in Mark and possibly derived from manuscript notes made by Mark himself, we may mention the story of the demoniac healed in the synagogue on the Sabbath,[37] the journey through Galilee,[38] the prayer of the demoniac,[39] the complaint of John against the man who would not follow them, but who would persist in casting out devils, nevertheless,[40] and the women bringing spices to the sepulcher.[41]

2. Among the eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word from whom Luke could have obtained some information we may be sure of some, at least. (1) As a physician Luke would come into confidential relations with many women, and as the women who ministered to Jesus and had had personal experiences with him during the course of his ministry came to know Luke and to like him and trust him they could tell him some of those things concerning women and their relation to Jesus which Luke alone has preserved for us. Such facts as we find in Luke 7. 36-50; 8. 2, 3; 10. 38-42; 11. 27; 23. 27-29, 49, 56 must have come from the women themselves.

(2) Luke seems to have had some special source of information concerning matters pertaining to the court of Herod. The information given us in such passages as

[37] Luke 4. 33-37.
[38] 4. 43, 44.
[39] 8. 38.
[40] 9. 49.
[41] 24. 1.

8. 3; 13. 32; 23. 5-12 is to be found in Luke's narrative alone. We read in Acts 13. 1 that Paul and his companions, among whom Luke may have been one, were associated with Manaen, the foster brother of Herod. It is easy to conclude that all inside information concerning Herod and his court came to Paul or to Luke through him. Sanday, however, is inclined to think that Luke's informant in these things was a woman, and he identifies her with Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, who was one of the women ministering of her substance to Jesus and his company,[42] and one of the group at the tomb on the resurrection morning.[43] Sanday thinks that she may have been Mary's confidante and the one who wrote down Mary's account of the Annunciation which Luke afterward used in his Gospel.[44]

(3) In Acts 21. 16 we are told that Luke lodged while at Jerusalem with Mnason of Cyprus, who had been a disciple from the beginning. Here, then, was another who could give him original information concerning many things.

(4) There must have been many other early disciples whom Luke met at various times. He may have met Peter and Barnabas at Antioch. He surely would meet James and the elders of the church when he came with Paul to Jerusalem.

(5) During the two years of Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea Luke became acquainted with Philip the evangelist and his daughters. All they knew as to the facts of Christ's life they would gladly share with Luke.

(6) At Cæsarea Luke was only fifty miles from Jerusalem, and there was a good road between the two cities; and he was only two days' journey from the shores of Lake Gennesaret. A man bent upon tracing accurately from the first the course of events in the life of the Lord hardly could have failed to visit these places, and, exploring among

[42] Luke 8. 3.
[43] Luke 24. 10.
[44] Expository Times, xiv, p. 299.

them and on into Peræa, Luke could have picked up such items of information as we find in 7. 11-17; 24. 13-35 and many things in the Peræan ministry which we find recorded nowhere else.

We do not know what Luke was doing during the two years of Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea, but we may be sure that he was employing his time well; and what more congenial employment could he have found than the gathering of materials for a narrative of the things which had been fulfilled in that vicinity in the founding of the Christian Church? He could interview any number of eyewitnesses and he could trace the course of all things accurately from the first in personal investigation. Did he write the Gospel at this time?

III. Date of the Gospel

There are those who think that Luke must have written the third Gospel either during Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea or the immediately succeeding imprisonment at Rome. The following authorities agree that the narrative as we have it was written before or about A. D. 63: Alford, Ebrard, Farrar, Gloag, Godet, Guericke, Hofmann, Horne, Hug, Keil, Lange, Lardner, Lumby, Michaelis, Schaff, Tholuck, Thomson, Wieseler, and others. They say: 1. The Gospel according to Luke must have been written before the book of Acts, and the book of Acts does not say anything about the death of Paul, and the close of its narrative seems to coincide with the date of Luke's writing. Therefore both the Gospel and the book of Acts were written before the date of Paul's martyrdom. 2. When Luke tells us about the prophecy of the famine made by Agabus in Acts 11. 28 he is careful to add that the prophecy was fulfilled in the days of Claudius, 44-48 A. D.; but when he tells us about the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem made by Jesus, in Luke 21. 5-36, he does not say that that prophecy was fulfilled. He surely would have done so if he had been

writing later than A. D. 70. He does not do so because the destruction of the capital city had not yet taken place.

However, many other authorities think that we must decide upon a later date for the composition of the third Gospel. They point out the following facts: 1. We must allow time for a large number of people to draw up narratives concerning the sayings and doings of Jesus.

2. Twice in the Gospel[45] Luke puts the name of John before that of his brother James in naming the two together. Matthew and Mark never do that. They always put James first. This seems to be an indication that Luke wrote at a later period than the other two synoptists, and at a time when James had died or when for some other reason John was being recognized as the more prominent or influential of the two.

3. The prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem as recorded in Luke are much more definite than the parallel prophecies in Matthew and Mark. Even though Luke does not say that these prophecies had been fulfilled, their greater definiteness bears witness to that fact. After the event the details of the sayings of Jesus concerning it were remembered more vividly and recorded more accurately.

4. In the midst of these prophecies in Matthew and Mark the evangelists have inserted a note of warning to their readers—"Let him that readeth understand."[46] Luke omits this clause, the time for such warning having gone by.

5. The designation of Jesus as "Lord," not found at all in Mark and only occasionally in Matthew, is more frequent in Luke. This seems to be a mark of later date, when this title was becoming more common among the disciples. Among those who believe that the Gospel was written after the death of Paul and after the destruction of Jerusalem

---

[45] 8. 51 and 9. 28.

[46] Matt. 24. 15; Mark 13. 14.

and in the later old age of Luke, we may mention Beyschlag, Bleek, Cook, Credner, De Wette, Holtzmann, Ewald, Jülicher, Meyer, Plummer, Ramsay, Renan, Reuss, Sanday, Schenkel, and Weiss.

IV. Place of Writing

Jerome says that Luke wrote the Gospel in Achaia and Boeotia. Godet selects the city of Corinth as the most likely place. Ewald, Holtzmann, Hug, Keim, and Zeller guess that the Gospel was written at Rome; Michælis, Kuinoel, Schott, Thiersch, and Tholuck at Cæsarea; Hilgenfeld in Asia Minor; and Köstlin at Ephesus. In the Peshito version the title reads, "The Gospel of Luke the evangelist, which he published and preached in Greek in Alexandria the Great." Plummer says there is no evidence for or against any of these places. Weiss adds that "all conjectures as to the place of composition are quite visionary and have no value whatever." Under these circumstances may we not conjecture that it was at Cæsarea in the days of Paul's imprisonment that the first considerable gathering of material for this Gospel narrative was made, and that Luke continued his work as opportunity offered during the later imprisonment at Rome, and that in the after days in the moments of leisure he may have snatched from his missionary labors he completed the book, giving it its final touches in some village retreat in Greece, and writing last of all the preface dedicating it to Theophilus some time between A. D. 70 and 80? This gradual gathering and shaping of the material in hand would leave room to account for all the phenomena involved in the text, and the final finishing in the intervals of an itinerant missionary village visitation in Greece would meet the requirements of Jerome's suggestion that it was composed in places in both Achaia and Bœotia. In various humble village homes by the light of a dim-burning olive-oil wick we see the beloved evangelist completing the most beautiful book ever written.

V. Characterizations of the Gospel

1. This is *The Gospel for the Gentiles.*

When we turn to the study of the book, the first thing we notice is that it is written from a Gentile point of view, and that makes it noteworthy at once. It is the only book in the New Testament of which that can be said, except the book of Acts, also written by Luke.

All the other books in our Bible, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, were written by Jews. Our Bible is a Jewish book from beginning to end, as far as authorship is concerned. Its writers were all of the Hebrew race, and they all had more or less of the Hebrew prejudice and point of view. Jesus was a Jew. All of the twelve apostles were Jews. All of the first churches were composed wholly of Jews. Even Paul, the champion of the Gentiles, was himself a Jew, and he never wholly freed himself from the results of his rabbinical training and thought. If Luke had not written these books, all of Gentile Christendom would have been dependent forever upon Jewish sources for the whole of its record of the revelation of God unto men. But in these two books we see how the life of Jesus and the fortunes of the early Christian Church appear from a Gentile point of view. The Gospel according to Matthew gives us a Jewish point of view. The Gospel according to Mark gives us a Jew's account, adapted to the use of Gentiles. Now Luke, a Gentile, will write for Gentiles, and our New Testament will have a Gentile Gospel, a Gospel written for us and by one of ourselves.

How do we know that Luke is writing for us rather than for the Jews? (1) Because of his explanations of things with which the Jews were perfectly familiar, but of which Gentiles might be supposed to be ignorant. He tells us that Nazareth was a city of Galilee.[47] He gives us the same

[47] 1. 26.

information concerning Capernaum.[48] He says that the feast of unleavened bread was called the passover.[49] All Jews knew these things without being told. Luke wrote them down for the benefit of those who were not acquainted with the geography of Palestine or with the feasts of the Jewish ritual. However, it is when we turn from such small details to consider the general spirit of the book that its Gentile point of view becomes most apparent.

(2) Of the three synoptic Gospels this is by far the most catholic in its sympathies and universalistic in its outlook. a. It has a genealogy of Jesus, even as Matthew had, but the genealogy of Matthew was a Jewish genealogy. It gave the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.[50] Abraham was the father of the Jews, and Matthew was content to show that Jesus was a descendant of Abraham, a genuine Jew by race. Luke is not content with that genealogy, and therefore he writes another one, and he carries the line of ancestors back of David and back of Abraham and up to Adam, the father of the human race. Then he says of Adam that he was the son of God.[51] Was Jesus a Jew and a son of Abraham, and did he therefore belong to the Jewish race? Yes, that was all true, but it was not the whole of the truth. Jesus was a Jew, but he was more than that: he was a man, and he belonged to all mankind.

That was the first thing which this Gentile Gospel would make perfectly clear to the world. Our Lord is a son of Adam, as we are sons of Adam. He is flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. He is our brother-man. He is not far from every one of us. Our God hath made of one blood all nations of men; and if any man will seek for our Lord, he will find that he is of one blood with himself, a son of Adam, a son of God. Jesus is the last Adam. He belongs to humanity. He is the Kinsman-Redeemer of the race.

[48] 4. 31.
[49] 22. 1.
[50] Matt. 1. 1.
[51] 3. 38.

Matthew gave us the Jewish genealogy. Luke makes it a Gentile genealogy by carrying it beyond Abraham the father of the Jews to Adam the father of the race. Jesus belongs to the Jews, but he belongs to us as well as to them. He is the Saviour of all men. He is the Head of all humanity.

b. We look into Matthew's narrative, and we find the story of the wise men coming from the East with their question, "Where is he who is born *King of the Jews?*" [52] We turn to Luke's account of the birth of Jesus and we find no such question, but an angel makes announcement from the open sky, "I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be *to all the people.*" [53] The Jesus of whom Luke writes is to be, not only the King of the Jews, but also the Saviour of all men.

c. Matthew tells us that Isaiah spoke of John the Baptist and called him

> "The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
> Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
> Make his paths straight." [54]

Luke tells us about the ministry of John the Baptist, and he quotes the prophecy of Isaiah as fulfilled in him; but he is not willing to stop where Matthew did in that quotation. He carries it on until he makes of it a prophecy of comfort to the Gentiles. He says: "Listen! These are the words with which Isaiah continues his prophecy,

> "Every valley shall be filled,
> And every mountain and hill shall be brought low;
> And the crooked shall become straight,
> And the rough ways smooth;
> And *all flesh shall see the salvation of God.*" [55]

---

[52] Matt. 2. 2.
[53] 2. 10.
[54] Matt. 3. 3.
[55] Luke 3. 5, 6.

It surely was worth while to add that sentence, for it shows that this Jewish prophecy is of interest to all mankind. Gentiles as well as Jews are to see the salvation of God.

d. Did Jesus confine practically the whole of his own ministry to the Jews? Yes, but Luke is careful to tell us what no one of the other evangelists had recorded for us, that in his ministry to the Jews Jesus reminded them again and again that the providence of God had been displayed in behalf of the Gentiles as well as in behalf of themselves. In the beginning of his ministry, in the synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus said: "There were many Jewish widows in the time of Elijah, but Elijah passed them all by and his miraculous help was given to a heathen widow in Sidon. And there were many Jewish lepers in the time of Elisha, but the prophet did not heal any of them. He healed the Syrian heathen Naaman instead." [56] The Jews were filled with wrath at these sayings and cast Jesus out of their city. That was just the difference between Jesus and his fellow countrymen, Luke seems to say. They were exclusive and intolerant; he was sympathetic with all. They wanted all good things for themselves; he shared all his good things with all who asked for them and all who needed them, Samaritans or Galileans, Gentiles or Jews.

e. Possibly the most characteristic parables of the gospel which Jesus preached are to be found in the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel according to Luke. Those three parables, the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son, sum up all the good news of certain salvation to sinful men, and two of them, the lost coin and the lost son, are recorded only by Luke. The three parables surely would rank among the most precious of all the sayings of Jesus. They teach the Father's uncalculating and unceasing sacrifice and search until the last lost sheep is found. They teach the Father's loving illumination and diligent labor until the last coin with his image and superscription upon it has been restored. They

[56] Luke 4. 25-30.

teach the Father's warm welcome for every prodigal who turns his face toward home. His grace is free to all, and it never fails. We could spare any other parable better than the parable of the prodigal son. We owe its preservation to the Gentile Luke.

f. We are not surprised to find that the words, "grace," "Saviour," "salvation," and "evangelize" are found in this Gospel more often than in any other. Luke himself was an evangelist. He tells us that the angels are evangelists,[57] and John the Baptist was an evangelist,[58] and Jesus was an evangelist,[59] and the twelve apostles were evangelists.[60] Ten times in this book that verb, "to evangelize," occurs. The whole of the Gospel has to do with good news for all.

In that first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth Jesus read for his text from the prophet Isaiah:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

There Jesus closed the book and gave it back to the attendant. It was a strange place to quit in his reading. It was in the middle of a sentence. Jesus did not read the whole of the prophecy. He did not even finish the paragraph. He did not even read to a period. There was much of comfort and of good news in the remainder of the sentence and of the paragraph and of the prophecy. Jesus stops short at this point. Surely, it must have been with conscious intention. Surely, it must have been with some good reason. We look for that reason and we find that the next

[57] 1. 19 and 2. 10.
[58] 3. 18.
[59] 4. 18, 43; 7. 22; 8. 1; 16. 16; 20. 1.
[60] 9. 6.

following words were, 'And to proclaim the day of vengeance of our God.' When the eyes of Jesus fell upon those words he closed the book. He would not read them. His message was a message of grace and not a proclamation of vengeance. He would rather leave the sentence unfinished than to leave any doubt in any mind as to that fact. He went on to preach his good tidings, and we read that all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth.[61]

Luke does not wonder. He seems to think that only words of grace would be natural to Jesus. He pictures the Master as the gracious Redeemer, gracious both in matter of speech and in manner of life. Over against the ungraciousness of Simon the Pharisee Luke sets in contrast the graciousness of Jesus to the woman who was a sinner. He was a perfect gentleman even to her. She had heard him talk of the grace of God. She was willing to put it to the test for herself. Jesus did not fail her in the moment of trial. His graciousness included all. It recognized no barrier of social distinctions. The courtesy which Simon had failed to show to his guest she more than made up with her love. Jesus could not be outdone in courtesy by anyone. He was even more gracious to her than she was grateful to him.[62]

Was the grace of God ever set forth with such pathetic impressiveness as in that pearl of all the parables, where we read that while the returning prodigal was yet a long way off his father saw him and ran to meet him, and then celebrated his return with the best robe and a fitting feast and music and dancing? The grace of the dancers was only the faintest symbol of the grace in that father's heart. No gracious act of earth can do more than typify the heavenly Father's exhaustless grace. Can we imagine the grace in the manner of Jesus and in his tone as he spoke that parable?

How gracious he was to the ten lepers, although one of

[61] 4. 22.
[62] 7. 48.

them was an alien Samaritan! How gracious he was to Zacchæus, promising salvation to his house, although he had been a defrauding and despicable publican, as little and mean in his spirit as he was little and mean in his stature. How gracious he was to Mary when Martha's short temper had snapped and she was ready to ask the Master to join her in scolding the remissness of the younger girl! Jesus was as gracious to her as her sister was indignant with her.

How gracious he was to that dying thief! The malefactor was suffering his just deserts. He had been a robber, and in all probability a murderer, and he was receiving the penalty due for his crimes. His fellow malefactor prayed to Jesus for salvation, "Save thyself and us," but it was in words of mockery and not of devotion; and Jesus paid no heed to him. Possibly he was the only one who ever asked Jesus for salvation and found his cry for help unheeded. The other dying thief recognized the innocence of Jesus and rebuked his fellow sufferer for his failure in courtesy to such a character. He did not ask for salvation from the cross or from death. He asked Jesus only to remember him when the kingdom preached had come. It was the most sublime faith chronicled in our New Testament. He believed in the character of Jesus and in the coming of his kingdom, despite all contrary evidence. All of the disciples of Jesus had forsaken him and fled away. They had seen Jesus raise the dead and yet their faith had failed them in that hour. The thief upon the cross sees Jesus dying upon the cross at his side, and yet has faith in him!

Now see with what graciousness Jesus makes response to such faith. "Verily—there is no doubt about it. I am not stating to you a mere possibility, but a most certain truth; for where I am there shall also my servants be with me; therefore,—I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." [63] Bossuet comments upon this promise as fol-

---

[63] *23. 43.*

lows: "To-day—what speed!—with me—what companionship!—in Paradise—what rest!" Jesus had consorted with all classes of people here upon the earth. He had been no respecter of persons during his ministry. He went into paradise hand in hand with a crucified thief. His graciousness will be his characteristic through all eternity to come. As it was manifest to all alike in the days of his ministry it will be manifest to all alike for evermore.

The Gospel according to Luke is preeminently the Gospel of God's Grace. It has surpassing graciousness of content and style. It sets forth the life of the gracious Master and Redeemer of men. It records his gracious words and deeds, and it is filled with his spirit of grace throughout. The pearl of all the parables is found in this Gospel, and it pictures the exhaustless grace of the Father's love. The heavenly Fatherhood was to Jesus the guarantee of boundless, exhaustless, infinite grace. It was in the faith of that gracious Fatherhood that Jesus lived and died. It was largely the manifestation of that grace in his life which made him the revealer of God unto men.

It is a noteworthy fact that Luke alone has the record of the earliest saying of Jesus when a boy of only twelve years, and also the only record of what probably was the last word spoken on the cross, and that these earliest and latest recorded sayings of the Redeemer are near allied. They both declare the faith of Jesus in the divine Fatherhood and his implicit confidence in the Father's providence and gracious care. The boy said, "I must be in my Father's house." The dying Saviour said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Here is the source of the graciousness of Jesus, in the grace of God the Father. We read in the Old Testament.

> "Jehovah is merciful and gracious,
> Slow to anger, and abundant in loving-kindness."

In the Sermon on the Mount, recorded by Matthew, Jesus

says, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." In the Sermon on the Plain, recorded by Luke, in the corresponding command we find Jesus saying, "Be ye merciful and gracious and full of loving-kindness, even as your Father is characterized by these things." We see the exemplification of the exhortation in his own life. The graciousness of Jesus is characteristic of both his manner and speech in the third Gospel, and the same graciousness becomes characteristic of the Gospel as well.

There is severity in this Gospel when severity is needed, but characteristically it is a Gospel of Grace. Paul says much about the grace of God, but what he says in the way of abstract doctrinal presentation Luke gives us in the way of concrete example. That makes it all so much more lifelike and interesting, and thousands appreciate and love the Gospel according to Luke, who find the Pauline Epistles more or less of a closed revelation. The Jesus of Luke seems so much nearer to them than the Jesus of Paul. The grace of God seems so much more tangible and accessible as illustrated in the pages of the Gospel. Divine Grace is the keynote of the whole narration.

g. At three crisis points in his narrative Luke shows us how Jesus was rejected by the Galilæans,[64] and by the Samaritans,[65] and by the Judæans and the assembled nation of the Jews at the passover feast.[66] The significant inference is that the gospel must look beyond all of these for its greatest future growth, and in the book of Acts Luke shows how that actually came to pass.

h. We note that in the beginning of the Gospel Luke is the only one of the evangelists who tells us the story of Simeon, and the only one to record the song of that aged saint:

---

[64] 4. 29.
[65] 9. 53.
[66] 23. 23.

"Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord,
According to thy word, in peace;
For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,
Which thou hast prepared before the face of *all peoples;*
A light for revelation to the Gentiles,
And the glory of thy people Israel." [67]

Luke sets that phrase, "a revelation to the Gentiles," in the very forefront of his Gospel.

Then we turn to the middle of the Gospel and in the tenth chapter we find a fuller account of the sending out of the seventy than any other evangelist has given us; and the commentators tell us that the Jews reckoned the Gentile nations to be seventy in number, and as the twelve apostles represented the twelve tribes of Israel the seventy evangelists by their very number represented the world-wide destination of the gospel. In the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis there is an enumeration of seventy nations, and the Jews believed that these nations represented the whole human race. Therefore, in the Talmud we find it recorded that at the feast of tabernacles the Jews offered seventy bullocks for the seventy nations, that the rain may fall on the fields of all the world.[68]

Then we turn to the end of the Gospel, and in its closing words we hear the resurrected Lord commissioning his church to preach repentance and remission of sins *unto all the nations,* beginning from Jerusalem.[69] In the beginning and the middle and the end of his Gospel Luke makes it clear that this revelation of good news is for *all the nations of men.*

i. When Matthew records the choice of the twelve apostles, and lists their names, he proceeds at once to give the charge which Jesus laid upon them before he sent them

---

[67] 2. 29-32.
[68] Lightfoot's Hor. Talm., John 7. 2.
[69] 24. 47.

forth, and the very first commandment laid upon them was this: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." [70] Luke tells us of the sending out of the twelve and of the charge given them by the Master, but he omits any refusal of the gospel to the Gentiles or any limitation of their ministry to the Jews.[71] In the next chapter he gives a much longer and fuller account of the sending out of the seventy, and no limitations are suggested for their evangelism, while their number suggested that they might go into all the world.

j. Luke was the first church historian. Mark and Matthew wrote memoirs. John wrote a philosophy of religion. No other writers in the New Testament devoted themselves to narration. Luke the Gentile set himself to write a historical gospel, following Gentile models at certain points and connecting his account with Gentile history throughout. He seems to have seen clearly from the very first that the interests of Christianity were bound up with the interests of world history and that the birth of Jesus was an event of importance to the whole Roman empire.

He is the only writer in the New Testament who mentions a Roman emperor by name, and he names three of them, Augustus, Tiberius and Claudius.[72] He joins the name of Jesus with that of the governor Quirinius and Cæsar Augustus.[73] He unites the baptism of John and the beginning ministry of Jesus with the reign of Cæsar Tiberius and the rule of Pilate and Hærod and Philip and Lysanias, as well as the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas.[74] In general, Luke has a much larger number of proper names than are to be found in the other Gospels, and many of these

---

[70] Matt. 10. 5, 6.
[71] 9. 1-6.
[72] 2. 1; 3. 1; Acts 11. 28; 18. 2.
[73] 2. 1, 2.
[74] 3. 1, 2.

are the names of those prominent in the political life of that day, and it follows, therefore, that almost all the connecting links between the gospel history and contemporary Gentile history are furnished us by Luke. He begins at Bethlehem, but he ends at Rome. He opens his narrative with the vision of Zacharias in the seclusion of the temple at Jerusalem, but he closes it with the preaching of the apostle Paul in the world capital. From beginning to end he is bent on showing that the gospel is a gospel for a world empire, for all nations of men, and for all the future ages of time.

Van Oosterzee was right when he said, "As Paul led the people of the Lord out of the bondage to the law into the enjoyment of gospel liberty, so did Luke raise sacred history from the standpoint of the Israelitish *nationality* to the higher and holier ground of universal *humanity*." [75] We owe that to this Gentile writer. His explanations for Gentile readers, his allusions to Gentile rulers and contemporary Gentile history, his characteristic additions of Gentile prophecies and promises and parables combine to make this the Gentile Gospel; and, surely, we Gentiles never can be grateful enough that so much of our New Testament was written from a Gentile point of view. As Paul is the apostle to the Gentiles, Luke is the evangelist for the Gentiles. The Gospel according to Luke and the book of Acts are written by a Gentile for the Gentile world.

2. This is *The Gospel of an Educated Man.*

Luke is the only one of the four evangelists who had a scientific training. We would expect to see the results of that training in his writings. We think that it is apparent in his Gospel in at least four particulars: (1) In his accuracy. He tells Theophilus that he has traced the course of events accurately from the first, and that therefore Theophilus may rest assured of the certainty of these things which he finds

[75] Quoted by Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 659.

here recorded.[76] Something of the scholar's exactness is included in the ideal of Luke, and he seems to have attained his ideal in a rather remarkable degree.

Modern criticism again and again has attacked the correctness of his statements, but it never has been successful in proving any serious mistake. It has become increasingly evident that it is dangerous to accuse Luke of inaccuracy in anything. Time and new discoveries have proven him right and his critics wrong again and again. Such eminent modern authorities as Harnack and Ramsay rank Luke "in the first class of historians, both for truthworthiness in his details, and in his judgment for selecting the subjects which are of the first importance and must be treated fully. . . . We may feel confident that he showed at least the same scrupulous accuracy in reporting Christ's teachings as he did in speaking of slight secular details." [77]

Luke has tolerated no carelessness in research or in composition. He seems to be dissatisfied with the unchronological arrangement of material in the previous gospel narratives, for he assures Theophilus that he will write events in order.[78] It probably is with this intent that he concludes the account of the ministry of John the Baptist before he begins the account of the ministry of Jesus.[79] We find a chronological arrangement throughout. First, we have preliminary and introductory material (1. 1 to 4. 13). Then follows the ministry of Jesus in Galilee (4. 14 to 9. 50). Then we read of the wider ministry outside of Galilee (9. 51 to 19. 28). Then come the closing scenes in Jerusalem (19. 29 to 24. 53). This division is altogether according to time.

Luke is careful to insert the proper dates upon occasion.[80]

---

[76] 1. 3, 4.

[77] Wilson, Origins and Aims of the Four Gospels, pp. 62-3.

[78] 1. 3.

[79] 3. 18-20.

[80] 1. 5; 2. 1, 2; 2. 21, 22; 2. 42; 3. 1, 2; 3. 23.

The Greek word for "year," ἔτος, is found in the writings of Luke twenty-six times and in all the other books of the New Testament only twenty-three times. The Greek word for "month," μήν, is found in Luke's writings ten times and in all the rest of the New Testament only eight times. The more frequent occurrence of these words in his writings is an indication of Luke's desire to be more accurate in his designations of time.

(2) Another result of Luke's university training is evident in his versatility. Plummer says: "The author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is the most versatile of all the New Testament writers. He can be as Hebraistic as the seventy, and as free from Hebraisms as Plutarch. And, in the main, whether intentionally or not, he is Hebraistic in describing Hebrew society, and Greek in describing Greek society." [81] It demands something of both talent and training to make such transitions of style possible.

(3) To accuracy and versatility we may add fluency as another evidence of higher education and broader culture. An untrained man may be very prolix in verbal statement of facts, but if he is set to write them down he is apt to make very short work of it. He is unaccustomed to the task of composition, and he finds it very difficult for him, and he confines himself to the recording of the barest outline or the main essentials. Other things being equal, facility of expression comes with practice, and an educated man will have had that practice and therefore will take more pleasure in literary composition. He will be ready to fill out the more meager outline and to add interesting details to the essential features of the narrative. He will give us a fuller and more symmetrical account. When we compare the Gospel according to Luke with the other synoptics we find these things to be true of it.

a. It is a more comprehensive account. It begins with the

[81] Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. xlix.

birth of the Forerunner and all the interesting events connected therewith. The contents of the first two chapters are peculiar to Luke. Mark began with the active ministry of John the Baptist. Matthew told us about the birth of Jesus. Luke goes back of these events to find the beginning of the new dispensation in the prophecy of the birth of John. Then Luke carries his narrative beyond that of any of the other Gospels. He is the only one who gives us any account of the ascension of Jesus, which would surely seem to be the only fitting end for such a career as that of the Incarnate One. In the middle of his Gospel Luke has given us a large section—9. 45 to 18. 30—the most of the material in which is peculiar to him. The other Gospels pass these events over in silence, and yet some of them are among the most remarkable in our Lord's ministry. This section is usually called "the greater insertion" in the gospel narrative. Schleiermacher called it "the journey account." Others have named it the "Gnomology." Altogether, about one third of the contents of Luke is not to be found in the other Gospels.

b. As the most comprehensive account, the Gospel according to Luke is the longest of the four Gospels. It has been calculated that when the contents of the synoptic Gospels have been divided into one hundred and seventy-two sections Luke has one hundred and twenty-seven, or about three fourths of these; Matthew has one hundred and fourteen, or about two thirds; and Mark has eighty-four, or about one half; and of these one hundred and seventy-two sections Luke has forty-eight, or about two sevenths peculiar to himself; Matthew has twenty-two, or about one eighth; and Mark has five, or about one thirty-seventh.

c. There are twenty miracles recorded in this Gospel, and six of these are peculiar to Luke. These are: The miraculous draught of fishes,[82] the raising of the widow's son at

[82] 5. 4-11.

Nain,[83] the healing of the woman bowed together,[84] the cure of the dropsical man,[85] the cleansing of the ten lepers,[86] the restoration of Malchus's ear.[87] Over against these six miracles peculiar to Luke, Matthew has only three peculiar to himself, and Mark has only two. Luke, therefore, has more than Matthew and Mark combined.

d. There are twenty-three parables recorded in this Gospel, and of these eighteen are peculiar to Luke. These are: The two debtors,[88] the good Samaritan,[89] the importunate friend,[90] the rich fool,[91] the watchful servants,[92] the barren fig tree,[93] the chief seats,[94] the great supper,[95] the rash builder,[96] the rash king,[97] the lost coin,[98] the lost son,[99] the unrighteous steward,[100] the rich man and Lazarus,[101] the unprofitable servants,[102] the unjust judge,[103] the Pharisee and publican,[104] the pounds.[105] Over against these eighteen parables peculiar to Luke, Matthew has only ten and Mark has only one. Therefore Luke has over a third more than Matthew and Mark combined.

These parables seem to be of quite a different character from those in the other synoptics. The parables in the first Gospel had to do chiefly with the kingdom and its laws. The parables in the Gospel according to Luke have an individual and purely human interest. They are more personal and more concrete. They do not seem so much like types of spiritual phenomena as they do like transcripts from

---

[83] 7. 11-17.
[84] 13. 10-17.
[85] 14. 1-7.
[86] 17. 11-19.
[87] 22. 50, 51.
[88] 7. 41-43.
[89] 10. 25-37.
[90] 11. 5-8.
[91] 12. 16-21.
[92] 12. 35-48.
[93] 13. 6-9.
[94] 14. 7-11.
[95] 14. 16-24.
[96] 14. 28-30.
[97] 14. 31, 32.
[98] 15. 3-10.
[99] 15. 11-32.
[100] 16. 1-13.
[101] 16. 19-31.
[102] 17. 7-10.
[103] 18. 1-8.
[104] 18. 10-14.
[105] 19. 11-27.

actual life. They are not so much concerned with analogies from nature as they are with accurate accounts of human nature. They do not idealize human nature. They represent it as it actually is. They are more like snapshots at contemporary occurrences. They are stories based on fact. They have to do with real men and women and the common things of daily life.

What testimony they bear to the freshness and originality of the conversation of Jesus! Some of these parables are spoken spontaneously in answer to some question put at him unexpectedly. He must have had a very ready wit and very unusual powers of observation to produce such apt illustrations of his truth at a moment's notice. No wonder the common people heard him gladly. He talked about things which they knew, and showed them hidden depths of wisdom where they had seen only the utterly commonplace. These parables would go home to the hearts of all. They showed the way of salvation from the materials close at hand. The truth embodied in these tales could be appreciated by anyone. Their simplicity was their chief charm. Their homeliness was one element of their power.

e. Of the interesting narratives peculiar to Luke we may mention as examples the events connected with the birth of John the Baptist and of Jesus, including the annunciation, the story of the shepherds, the meeting with Simeon and with Anna,[106] the temple visit at the age of twelve,[107] the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth,[108] the feast in the home of Simon the Pharisee,[109] the intolerance of James and John,[110] the story of Martha and Mary,[111] the story of Zacchæus,[112] the story of the penitent thief,[113] and the story of the walk to Emmaus.[114] The mere mention of

[106] 1. 5 to 2. 40.
[107] 2. 41-52.
[108] 4. 16-30.
[109] 7. 36-50.
[110] 9. 49-54.
[111] 10. 38-42.
[112] 19. 1-10.
[113] 23. 40-43.
[114] 24. 13-35.

these narratives and miracles and parables makes it evident at once that the greater length of the third Gospel is not due to any mere padding or prolixity; for these things belong to the most precious portions of the record of the life and teaching of our Lord. Yet the longest Gospel might have been due to a greater abundance of material on hand or to a greater abundance of leisure for writing. The final and crowning test of an educated man's composition will be found in his literary style. To accuracy, versatility, fluency does Luke add beauty of literary style?

(4) Renan says that this is "the most literary of the Gospels," and he adds that it is "a beautiful narrative, well contrived, at once Hebraic and Hellenic, uniting the emotion of the drama with the serenity of the idyl." [115]

Notice (a) the language Luke employs. It is the most beautiful Greek in the New Testament, with the possible exception of that found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Luke is less Hebraic than the other evangelists. Yet his first two chapters have a stronger Hebraic coloring than any other portion of the New Testament, and this is a proof either of Luke's personal versatility or of his faithful reproduction of some Hebraic original of this part of his narrative. When he is Hebraic he is thoroughly so; but when he writes Greek it is better Greek than the other evangelists could command; and where he is most independent of all previous effort, as in the preface to his own narrative, his Greek is of the finest quality and merits comparison with the best of the classical models. Taking the Gospel as a whole, its Greek will be found to stand about midway between the classical perfection of the ancients and the common, or Hellenistic, Greek of Luke's day. It is the Greek of an educated man as distinguished from the current Greek of ordinary use.

Notice (b) that Luke has the richest vocabulary of any of

---

[115] Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

the gospel writers. The words peculiar to Luke in the New Testament are variously estimated, according to various readings of the text, from seven hundred and fifty to eight hundred and fifty-one; and in the Gospel from two hundred and sixty-one to three hundred and twelve of these occur. Matthew has only seventy words peculiar to him in the New Testament, Mark forty-four, and John fifty. The richness of a man's vocabulary is usually a very fair measure of the degree of his culture. The uneducated man has a very limited fund of words at his command. The well-read and well-trained man is adding continually to his supply.

Notice (c) the very effective contrasts which are characteristic of Luke's grouping of his material. All through the Gospel we find two opposing characters set side by side, that we may see them together and mark the difference between them. There are the two annunciations in the beginning, to Zacharias slow to believe and to Mary the instantly obedient. Then follow such contrasts as those offered by Simon and the sinful woman, Martha and Mary, the ungrateful Jewish lepers and the grateful Samaritan, the unneighborly Levite and priest and the neighborly Samaritan, the Pharisee and the publican, the rich man and Lazarus, the prodigal and his elder brother, the sleepy and surly friend and the sleepless and gracious God, the unjust judge and the loving Father of all, the hostile priesthood and the hearkening people, the work of Jesus and the work of the devil, and the blessings and the woes of the Sermon on the Plain.

Sanday says that Luke has more literary ambition than his fellows.[116] Ramsay declares that he "brings to the treatment of his subjects genius, literary skill, and sympathetic historical insight." Plummer says: "He possesses the art of composition. He knows not only how to tell a tale truthfully, but how to tell it with effect. . . . As the fine liter-

[116] Book by Book, p. 401.

ary taste of Renan affirms, it is the most beautiful book in the world." [117]

3. This is *The Gospel of the Physician.*

If Paul had not told us that Luke was a physician we could have been assured of it from the internal evidence afforded in his writing. (1) This is apparent in his frequent references to the healing work of Jesus.[118]

(2) Luke is the only one of the evangelists to record the surgical miracle of the healing of Malchus's ear.[119]

(3) Of the six miracles recorded by Luke alone, five are miracles of healing, if we include among them the raising of the widow's son at Nain.[120] The four others are, the healing of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years,[121] and of the man afflicted with the dropsy,[122] the cleansing of the ten lepers,[123] and the restoration of Malchus's mutilated ear.[124]

(4) Luke alone quotes the proverb from the lips of Jesus, "Physician, heal thyself";[125] and he tells us that Jesus declared that this title of "Physician" would be popularly applied to him in his work.

(5) Luke is more circumstantial in his description of diseases than any other writer in the New Testament, as in Luke 4. 8; 5. 12; 22. 44; Acts 3. 7; 9. 18; 10. 9, 10; 12. 23; 28. 8.

(6) Luke frequently gives us the symptoms of disease and the duration of the sickness, and marks for us the stages of the patient's recovery. He seems to distinguish between cases of possession and ordinary forms of physical infirmity, as in 6. 17, 18.

(7) It has been noted that the Gospel of the physician is also the Gospel of the psychologist. Where Mark tells us

---

[117] Plummer, *op. cit.*, xlvi.
[118] 4. 18; 9. 1; 9. 2; 9. 6; 10. 9.
[119] 22. 51.
[120] 7. 11-17.
[121] 13. 10-17.
[122] 14. 1-6.
[123] 17. 11-19.
[124] 22. 51.
[125] 4. 23.

only about outward actions and looks, Luke makes some comment concerning the mental attitude involved, as in 3. 15; 6. 11; 7. 39. A skillful physician will look beyond external symptoms to the mental phenomena. It is characteristic of our own age that more attention than formerly was believed necessary is now given to the state of the mind in the treatment of all disease. But all first-class physicians have always been more or less interested in psychology as an aid in their work; and Luke appears to have belonged in this class.

Strange and unexpected touches occur in Luke's narrative, corresponding to the astonishing and inexplicable psychological experiences of ordinary life. Peter is amazed at the wonder-working power displayed by the Lord in the miraculous draught of fishes, and he is never more determined to cleave to this new Master through sunshine and storm. Yet what does he do? The most foolish and inexplicable thing. He falls at the knees of Jesus and cries "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." [126] How could Jesus depart from him? They were in a boat, out on the water. It was not convenient for anyone to leave that boat just at that moment. Moreover, Peter did not wish for Jesus to depart anyway. It would have been more becoming for him to go away, if anybody had to leave, than for him to order the Master to depart from him. It was all utterly foolish and inexcusable, just as the psychological processes of such a mind as Peter's so often are.

The risen Lord appeared among his disciples, and showed them his hands and his feet, that they might be convinced of his identity. It is Luke who puts down that extraordinary statement at that point. "They yet believed not for joy." [127] What a natural touch that was! They believed it, and yet it was too good to be true.

The Lord had ascended into heaven, and the disciples

[126] 5. 8, 9.
[127] 24. 41.

were to see him no more. Luke makes that statement of fact and then ends the book with the astonishing comment that the disciples "worshiped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, blessing God." [128] No loud lamentation, no rending of their garments, no forty-day period of mourning; nothing but praise and joy!

(8) There is an indication that the writer of the third Gospel and the book of Acts is a physician which is all-sufficient in itself, and which has seemed to most people to be altogether conclusive in the matter. These books are filled with technical medical terms, such as can be paralleled only in the writings of men in the medical profession itself. The Rev. W. K. Hobart has written a volume of more than three hundred pages entitled The Medical Language of Luke, in which he has made a list of some four hundred terms used more frequently by Luke than by others, or used by Luke alone among the writers of the New Testament, and found also in the Greek medical writers. Some of these are purely technical terms, not likely to be in use anywhere except in professional circles.[129] In 18. 25, where Mark and Matthew have the more common word for "needle," *ῥαφίς*, Luke uses the word for the surgical needle, *βελόνη*. In Acts 13. 11 Luke uses a word for a disease of the eye, occurring frequently in Galen, but found nowhere else in our New Testament or the Septuagint, *ἀχλύς*.

Of course, all people are apt to use medical phraseology sometimes. The apostle Paul has many medical metaphors in his epistles. It has been an interesting subject for discussion and investigation as to how far Paul's companionship with Luke the physician may have been responsible for these medical terms in his usage. However, no one is apt to use these medical terms and phrases continually except a medical man. Such a man will use them, not only

[128] 24. 52, 53.
[129] 4. 38, 39; 16. 19-26.

in the technical description of disease, but even in reference to the affairs of ordinary life. Now, the abundance of the medical terms in the third Gospel distinguishes it from all the others as the work of a physician, and nearly one hundred of these terms are such as only a physician might be expected to use.

Harnack gives pages of evidence on this subject which he sums up in these words: "When a physician writes a historical work it does not necessarily follow that his profession shows itself in his writing; yet it is only natural for one to look for traces of the author's medical profession in such a work. These traces may be of different kinds: (1) the whole character of the narrative may be determined by points of view, aims, and ideals which are more or less medical (disease and its treatment); (2) marked preference may be shown for stories concerning the healing of diseases, which stories may be given in great number and detail; (3) the language may be colored by the language of physicians (medical technical terms, metaphors of medical character, etc.). All these three groups of characteristic signs are found in the historical work which bears the name of Luke. Here, however, it may be objected that the subject-matter itself is responsible for these traits, so that their evidence is not decisive for the medical calling of the author. Jesus appeared as a great physician and healer. All the evangelists say this of him; hence it is not surprising that one of them has set this phase of his ministry in the foreground, and has regarded it as the most important. Our evangelist need not, therefore, have been a physician, especially if he were a Greek, seeing that in those days Greeks with religious interests were disposed to regard religion mainly under the category of healing and salvation. This is true; yet such a combination of characteristic signs will compel us to believe that the author was a physician if (4) the description of the particular cases of disease shows distinct traces of medical diagnosis and scientific knowledge;

(5) if the language, even where questions of medicine or of healing are not touched upon, is colored by medical phraseology; and (6) if in those passages where the author speaks as an eyewitness medical traits are especially and prominently apparent. These three kinds of tokens are also found in the historical work of our author. It is, accordingly, proved that it proceeds from the pen of a physician."[130] This puts the truth as clearly as it may be stated. Those who are interested in the proof in detail will find it in the pages of Hobart and Harnack.

(9) With these facts in mind it is interesting to notice one difference between Mark's account and Luke's account of the woman who was healed by touching the hem of the garment of Jesus. Mark tells us that "she had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse."[131] That, surely, is a bad showing for the medical profession. Would Luke be likely to write down such an indictment of his own calling in life? We turn to his account[132] and we find that in the Vatican manuscript and the Westcott and Hort text and the margin of the Revised Version Luke omits all these severe reflections upon the physicians and contents himself with the simple statement, "She was not able to be healed by any." This is hardly an adequate translation. What Luke really means to say is that the woman lacked all vital energy in herself, so that she seemed to be beyond the hope of any favorable response to medical treatment. It was a case of chronic debility so pronounced that nothing seemed to be left for a physician to build upon. It was not the fault of the physicians that she could not be cured. It was her own condition which seemed incurable. Luke, the physician, would not have been likely to write any of those things recorded by Mark. Some of

[130] Harnack, Luke the Physician, pp. 175, 176.
[131] 5. 25, 26.
[132] 8. 43.

the old manuscripts retain the clause in the text of Luke, "and she had spent all her living upon physicians," but it is better to omit it, as Westcott and Hort have done.

(10) We notice in closing this list of the evidences in the writings of Luke that they are the product of one who represents the point of view of the medical profession, that almost the last words Luke has written at the close of the book of Acts consist of a quotation from Isaiah ending with the words, "and I will heal them." [133] It is the healing power of Jehovah upon which he lays emphasis last. Here, then, we have a list of ten of the direct evidences of his professional calling to be found in the writings of Luke. They are cumulative in effect, and, taking them all together, we are disposed to be exceedingly glad that one of our Gospels was written by a Gentile, and that he was an educated man and that his profession was that of a physician.

When we turn from the direct evidences to those which are more indirect we find this feeling enhanced. A physician, like an evangelist or any true minister of the gospel, must be no respecter of persons. He must be interested in all classes alike, and must devote himself to the helping and healing of all. But there is one class in which the physician as a professional man is more interested than the lawyer or the preacher or any other servant of society. That is the class of the very young.

The physician ought to be expert in the diseases of infancy. It is a part of his duty to help the little ones through the period of their greatest helplessness and infirmity into good health and vigorous physical life. The sympathy and love of the physician's heart goes out continually to the innocent and helpless lambs of the flock. Now, it surely is characteristic of the third Gospel that more than the others it is interested in the little folks.

4. This is *The Gospel of Childhood.*

It is a strange fact that there is not a child in the fourth

[133] 28. 27.

Gospel from beginning to end. If that were the only picture we had of the ministry of Jesus all the children would have disappeared from it and all the children might have felt that they had no share in it to-day. On the contrary, the third Gospel is the Gospel of childhood.

(1) Luke alone tells us about the birth and infancy of John the Baptist, and all the marvels connected with it, the annunciation to Zacharias in the temple, the paralysis of the tongue of that unbeliever, the miraculous quickening of Elisabeth in her old age, the restoration of the power of speech to Zacharias at the time of the birth of his son, and the use he made of it in singing a psalm of praise to God. This birth in old age, this temporary dumbness, and this loosening of a paralyzed tongue are all of interest to the physician as well as to the writer of the gospel history.

(2) Matthew tells us something about the birth of Jesus, but Luke adds the story of the annunciation to Mary, the visit to Elisabeth, the singing of the Magnificat, the heralding of the heavenly host, the visit of the shepherds, the circumcision, the purification, the meeting with Simeon and Anna, the child's growth in wisdom and stature and grace, and the twelve-year-old boy's interest in the temple and its teachers of the law.

(3) Mark and Matthew told us how they brought little children to Jesus, but Luke tells us that these little ones were babes, *τὰ βρέφη*. They were innocent, helpless, clinging, dependent, trustful infants in their mothers' arms of whom Jesus said, "To such belongeth the kingdom of God." [134] The first two chapters of the third Gospel always will be the chapters we shall most delight to read to the children and the chapters which the children will be most delighted to hear. They always will love best the Gospel with the story of the shepherds and the angels, the Gospel which tells how Jesus allowed the mothers to bring their babies to him,

[134] Luke 18. 15-17.

the Gospel written by the beloved physician who loved the little folks and so thought it worth while to write a part of his story for them.

5. This is *The Gospel of Womanhood.*

A physician because of his profession is brought into more confidential relations with women than any other professional man is likely to be. A lawyer probably will deal most of the time with men. A minister ought to be interested equally in the men and the women of his community. But since, apart from helpless infancy, woman physically is the weaker vessel, a physician is apt to find that the most of his time and attention is occupied with the care of women and children; and if he is of a naturally kindly disposition he will find his sympathies going out to these in large measure, and as he becomes beloved and trusted, he will find that their confidence is given to him as to no other professional man. The third Gospel has many items of intimate information concerning women which may have come to Luke in this way. There is such a number of these that the third Gospel has come to be called the "Gospel of Womanhood." We note some of the reasons for giving it this title.

(1) Luke tells us more about women than the other synoptics combined. The word γυνή, "woman," occurs in Mark and Matthew forty-nine times, and in Luke alone forty-three times, almost as many times as in the two others put together. The pages of this Gospel are filled with the figures of women, and some of them are not to be found in the other Gospels at all.

(2) We are indebted to Luke alone for much of our information concerning the Virgin Mary. The old tradition which declared that Luke was a painter, and that he had painted the portrait of the Virgin Mary, was not so far wrong after all, for it is from the pages of Luke that we are able to reproduce any satisfying portrait of the Virgin Mary to-day. Mark mentioned her name, and Matthew told

us something about the trouble she had with Joseph, who was minded to put her away; but it is in Luke's narrative alone that we are permitted to see the events circling about the birth of the God-Man from the standpoint of the human mother involved in the great mystery. Luke alone tells us about the annunciation to Mary, and we have a glimpse of that moment of transcendent revelation to the Virgin who was to bear a Child, some inkling of the profound perplexity into which she was inevitably thrown, some conception of the absolute sublimity of self-surrender to that sword which was to pierce her soul and to that exaltation over all womankind forevermore.

Luke has pictured for us Mary the maid and Mary the mother as the type of perfect womanhood. She has been worshiped by multitudes of Christians, and she has been reverenced by all the disciples of Jesus as the pure Virgin who bore our Lord and the saintly mother who trained the Child in the ways of righteousness in the Nazareth home. In Luke we see Mary hastening away to her kinswoman, Elisabeth, that she may pour into the ear of that older and trusted friend all her tale of high favor and great grief. In Luke we hear Mary singing the Magnificat, that spontaneous outburst of the maiden's overflowing thanksgiving to God:

"My soul doth magnify the Lord,
And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.
For he hath looked upon the low estate of his handmaid:
For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." [135]

In Luke alone we have a glimpse of the mother laying the Child in the manger and receiving the shepherds with modest dignity and listening to their tale of angel messages and songs, and then treasuring these things in her heart

[135] I. 46-48.

through all the long days and years. In Luke we see her in the temple, bringing the appointed sacrifice of the poor, and meeting Simeon and Anna, and hearing the prophecy of her own woe and the redemption to be accomplished through her son. In Luke we read of Mary searching through the caravan and then through the sacred city for the twelve-year-old Boy who had strangely disappeared, but who told her when he had been discovered that the temple was the only place in which they need have looked for him. Then we read again that Mary kept all these sayings in her heart.

Tradition said that Luke painted the portrait of Mary and carried it with him in his evangelistic labors, and that miracles were wrought by means of it, and that it greatly helped him in his preaching. It has been an aid to gospel preaching through all the centuries that Luke has given us in this book the picture of this maid and mother who serves as a type of model womanhood. But there are other women in these pages besides this mother of our Lord.

(3) Luke tells us all that we know about the cousin of the Virgin Mary, the saintly Elisabeth, the one to whom the Virgin turned first for confidence and consolation in the hour of her great trouble and joy.

(4) Luke tells us about the saintly prophetess Anna, one of the quiet of the land, worshiping and fasting and praying night and day in the temple and waiting for the coming of the Lord. There they stand in those first two chapters: the saintly Virgin, the saintly wife, and the saintly widow —Mary, Elisabeth, Anna—bearing their witness that now a new gospel to saintly womanhood had come into the world.

(5) Luke tells us of that company of women who ministered of their substance to the twelve and their Master, because they had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities —Mary of Magdala, Joanna, Susanna, and many others.[136] It is Luke alone who gives us this picture of Jesus, "accom-

[136] 8. 2, 3.

panied in his mission journeys—not by warriors like David, not by elders like Moses, not by kings and princes like the Herods—but by a most humble band of ministering women." [137] "The Teacher who included in his church the humble, the distressed, and the repentant, is attended by the weak and loving rather than by a council of elders, a band of warriors, or a school of prophets." [138] "The scribes and Pharisees gathered up their robes in the streets and the synagogues, lest they should touch a woman, and held it a crime to look on an unveiled woman in public; our Lord suffered a woman to minister to him out of whom he had cast seven devils." [139]

(6) Luke has given us that picture of the visit of Jesus to the home of Martha and Mary, and a glimpse at the typically different characters of those two sister disciples.[140]

(7) Luke tells us of the widow of Nain and how the coming of Jesus turned her mourning into joy. The Lord had compassion upon her and said to her, "Weep not." [141]

(8) The evangelist Luke has recorded the parable of the importunate widow and the unjust judge.[142] These three widows—Anna, praying in the temple; the weeping widow at Nain; the impatient, persistent, pestiferous widow of the parable—appear in the third Gospel alone and are in themselves sufficient to make this "Gospel of Womanhood" a "Gospel of Widowhood" as well. A worshiping widow, a weeping widow, a wrangling widow; a saintly widow, a sorrowing widow, an insufferable widow; a widow eighty-four years in saintly and patient expectation of the coming of her Lord, an unfortunate widow mourning the loss of her only son, an importunate widow in as full contrast with

---

[137] Farrar, Messages of the Books, p. 81.
[138] Bishop Westcott.
[139] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 663.
[140] 10. 38-42.
[141] 7. 11-15.
[142] 18. 1-8.

the quiet and patient saints of the Lord as the unjust judge is in contrast with the loving and patient Father of all. We owe the pictures of these three widows to Luke alone.

(9) Luke tells us of the healing of that daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound for eighteen years.[143] The ruler of the synagogue was moved with great indignation that day, but Jesus lifted the burden from that woman's shoulders, loosened the bonds which had bowed her together for years, and permitted her to stand straight and glorify God before them all. The miracle might be taken as a parable of the change Christianity has wrought in the condition of womanhood in the world. Woman is no longer bound and bowed; at the word of Jesus she stands straight. Wherever the ministry of Jesus has come she has been made to glorify God.

(10) Luke has given us that story of the anointing of Jesus by the woman who had been a sinner, at the feast in the house of Simon the Pharisee.[144] Could we lose out of the gospel story the parable of the two debtors and this whole picture of the relation between our compassionate Lord and all truly repentant souls? This woman had sinned, but her love had won forgiveness; she had sinned, but his love had made her clean. He accepted the sacrifice her affection was so willing to make; he did not repulse her before the throng; he acknowledged their previous relationship; he promised her that she might go in peace. There is all the union of purity and compassion, of dignity and genuine affection which we would expect to find in the loving Saviour of men. Luke alone has given us this narrative.[145]

(11) In the other Gospels we read how Jesus defended

---

[143] 13. 10-17.

[144] 7. 36-50.

[145] For the reasons for concluding that this narrative has no parallel in the other Gospels, see Andrews, The Life of Our Lord, pp. 281-286.

himself against the blasphemous charge of the Pharisees that he was in league with Beelzebub, but it is Luke alone who records the fact that at the close of that defense some warmhearted woman in the throng lifted up her voice impulsively in defiance of his enemies and in utter loyalty to him, saying, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck." [146] It was a blessing pronounced upon Mary the mother, but it was a woman's tribute to the greatness and the goodness of Mary's Son.

(12) Luke tells us that on the way to the cross a multitude of women followed him, weeping and lamenting his fate; but Jesus turned to them and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children." [147] His compassion for the women and for the little ones was dominant within him to the very last.

(13) Epiphanius tells us that in Marcion's version of the Gospel according to Luke he had inserted as a part of the charge made by the Jews against Jesus in the trial before Pilate, "This man perverts the women and the children." The insertion bears its witness to the attraction which the personality of Jesus must always have had for these more dependent classes of society. The children loved him and followed him. The women ministered to him gladly of their substance. Doubtless there were some of the Jews who thought it would be better for their wives to stay at home and to learn from their husbands in silence and seclusion and subjection there rather than to be running about the country after this new teacher and squandering their means in the support of him and his able-bodied but idle attendants. Doubtless there were some fathers who wondered why their children did not run to them so gladly and listen to them so eagerly as they did to this stranger; and it must have seemed to them that their families were being perverted, and it would be just as well for this man to be put out of the

[146] 11. 27.

[147] 23. 27, 28.

way. They were right in thinking that a revolution was impending in those days. They were wrong in thinking that the death of Jesus would put an end to it.

The rights of childhood had been recognized once for all. The emancipation of womanhood had been proclaimed for all time to come. The Saviour of the world was to be the Saviour of women and the Saviour of the little ones. Henceforth they would follow him into the kingdom of God. The beloved physician has given us in his Gospel this picture of the compassionate Christ, interested like himself in these weaker and more helpless members of society, and beloved like himself by those to whom he gave his ceaseless sympathy and service.

6. This is *The Gospel for the Poor.*

A good physician is ready to respond to any cry of need. His professional knowledge is at the service of all. He can be no respecter of persons in his practice. He must give as much attention to the needs of his poor patients as he does to those of the rich. A beloved physician will be a philanthropist, a lover of man as man. The physician who works only for fat fees and who goes only when summoned by the well-to-do may make his fortune, but he will miss his greatest professional opportunity in the service of the poor. The poor people are in the majority, and when they are sick their need of a good physician is greater than that of the comfortable and rich. With unskillful nursing and unsanitary surroundings and unwholesome food all the resources of the physician are taxed to the utmost to save the life; and a good physician finds that his sympathies are poured out in the effort to help the needy poor.

Luke was such a good physician. He lived and died a poor man, and he gave the most of his service to the poor. He naturally is interested to show that the gospel news he has to record is of immediate concern to the most needy classes, and among these to the humble and the poor. He says so much about these that this third Gospel has been

called the Gospel of the Ebionites, the Ebionites deriving their name from the Hebrew word *Ebion*, "poor." Let us notice a few of the facts which lead to such a conclusion.

(1) The angel Gabriel is sent to make the annunciation of the Messiah's birth, not to any royal palace, not to any mansion of the rich, but to a plainly furnished and poverty-stricken peasant's home. There to a humble maiden of the multitude of the poor in the land was his message given that the Messias would come. Luke alone has recorded that scene.[148]

(2) Mary went to see her kinswoman, Elisabeth, and there she sang her Magnificat:

> "He hath put down princes from their thrones,
> And hath exalted them of low degree.
> The hungry he hath filled with good things;
> And the rich he hath sent empty away." [149]

Luke alone has recorded the song.

(3) Luke alone tells us how this marvelous birth took place. He says that the Saviour was born in a stable. He says that the Messias was laid in a manger. He says that the Incarnate God could find no room in the inn.[150] Was this the way for the King of kings and the Lord of lords to enter upon his inheritance?

Jesus is born in the extremest poverty of surroundings. It has been said that the shortest biography of Jesus ever written was that in which the apostle Paul expressed the bald fact and the whole astonishing truth of the incarnation in one word, ἐπτώχευσεν, He became poor.[151] It is Luke who has given us the historical setting for this assertion in his story of the Saviour's birth.

(4) In Matthew's story the Magi appear in Jerusalem

[148] 1. 26-38.
[149] 1. 52, 53.
[150] 2. 7.
[151] 2 Cor. 8. 9.

and make inquiry of the king in his palace and of the scribes who were the masters of the law. The news is thus given in the capital and to the chief rulers of the nation. In Luke no such public proclamation takes place. The only people who are told about this transcendent mystery of the incarnation are some shepherd lads, keeping watch by night over their flocks on the Bethlehem hills. Those poor fellows had no gifts to bring to Mary or to Jesus, but they heard the good news of great joy which should be to all people and they spread that news among the poor people everywhere.[152]

(5) According to Luke, who has made the only record of them, later revelations were accorded to some quiet and obscure people, Simeon and Anna,[153] not to Augustus at Rome, nor to Annas, the high priest at Jerusalem.

(6) Luke is careful to tell us that when the days of purification were ended, and the parents made their sacrifice in the temple, they offered a pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons, the sacrifice of the very poor.[154]

(7) Luke alone tells us that when John the Baptist came preaching he said to the multitudes, "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise." [155] John the Baptist believed that the sharing of superfluities in practical philanthropy would solve the problem of the poor, or, at least, it would help to solve the problem of the equitable distribution of wealth.

(8) When Jesus was ready to begin his ministry Luke records his first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth, and he says that the first words which Jesus uttered were these:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor." [156]

[152] 2. 8-20.
[153] 2. 25-38.
[154] 2. 22-24.
[155] 3. 11.
[156] 4. 18.

According to Luke, the gospel of Jesus is a gospel to the poor. That text from Isaiah was the fitting motto for the beginning and the middle and the end of his ministry. It summarized the whole of his mission to men.

(9) In Luke 14. 33 we find Jesus saying, "Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple"; and Luke alone has recorded the fact that when Jesus called Peter and Andrew and James and John and Matthew into his service they all of them left all and followed him.[157]

(10) Where Matthew has written the Beatitude of our Lord, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," Luke has it, "Blessed are ye poor";[158] and where Matthew has written, "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness," Luke has it, "Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled."[159] Where Matthew has only Beatitudes, Luke adds some "Woes"—"Woe unto you that are rich!"[160] and, "Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger."[161]

(11) Luke records the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in which the poor beggar has the advantage at last.[162]

(12) Luke has the parable of the rich fool, who labored long and gained much and lost everything in one night, including his soul.[163] Was there ever such a vivid picture of utter selfishness put into so brief a form? Look at the possessive pronouns, "*my* fruits, *my* barns, *my* grain, *my* goods, *my* soul." No one of those things belonged to him, least of all his soul. That was taken away from him in one night, and then to whom did all the other things belong? Look at the personal pronouns, "What shall *I* do? This will *I* do. Then *I* will say to my soul." There are seven of these future tenses in the Greek, all showing how happy he

[157] 5. 11, 28.
[158] 6. 20.
[159] 6. 21.
[160] 6. 24.
[161] 6. 25.
[162] 16. 19-31.
[163] 12. 16-21.

is going to be in some future day. They are followed by six present tenses, all utterly selfish, but all postponed to that future day which never dawned. "I *will* say, Eat, drink, rest, rejoice"; but he never lived to say it, much less really to do any of these things.

(13) Luke also has that parable about the chief seats at the feast, closing with the promise, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." [164]

(14) Luke tells us of that great supper to which the "poor and maimed and blind and lame" were invited.[165] It is a symbol of the gospel feast set forth in all these pages written by Luke. It is all for the poor and for the poorest of the poor. Luke is ready to go out into the highways and the hedges and constrain these impoverished and neglected ones to come in. By way of contrast, remember what Voltaire said to D'Alembert: "We have never pretended to enlighten the cobblers and the maid-servants. We leave that for the apostles." That is the work in which Paul delighted. That is the work to which Luke devoted himself. Jesus was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor. The gospel of his anointed ones will be, like this Gospel according to Luke, a gospel of comfort and encouragement and salvation to the poor.

It may be well to suggest, before leaving this subject, that while Luke evidently had an overflowing sympathy for the poor, his book does not lead us to think that he had any prejudice against wealth as such, any more than Jesus had. Riches never harmed a man unless he tried to find his happiness in them. If he allowed them to stand between him and the kingdom, they made him infinitely poor. That seemed to be the case with the rich young ruler. He would not follow Jesus if he must forsake his wealth. He preferred earthly substance to his soul's salvation. That was a

---

[164] 14. 7-11.
[165] 14. 21.

fatal choice. He trusted to his riches for his supreme satisfaction and he went away sorrowful rather than satisfied.

It was not because he was rich that he could not be saved. It was because he trusted in riches more than in a Redeemer. A poor man can do that as well as a rich man. A poor man can feel sure that if he had riches he could take care of himself, and if he trusts in riches to that extent the wealth he has not can keep him out of the kingdom. Jesus said, "Children, how hard is it for *them that trust in riches* to enter into the kingdom of God!" That warning was as applicable to those poor disciples as to any others. They, too, must put their trust in God rather than in mammon, in order to be saved. Wealth never saved a man, and wealth just as surely never damned a man. It is the use of wealth which determines its relation to a man's character.

(1) In the parable Abraham is in bliss, and Abraham presumably was just as rich a man upon earth as the rich man whom the parable shows us in torments. The difference between Abraham and Dives was not one of wealth, but one of character.

(2) Luke alone tells us about Zacchæus, and we learn that Zacchæus was a very wealthy man; and when he decides to keep half of his possessions there is no hint that either Jesus or Luke thought that he ought to have given up all.

(3) In the various discussions throughout the Gospel concerning masters and servants there is no suggestion that it is wrong to have servants, and in one passage the Master plainly says that he who sits at meat is superior to him who serves,[166] but it is a kind of superiority which he himself does not desire.

(4) Possibly Luke is more insistent than either Matthew or Mark upon the fact that Joseph of Arimathæa, while a rich man, was also a good and righteous man, and one who was looking for the kingdom of God.[167]

[166] *22. 27.*

[167] *23. 50, 51.*

These indications are sufficient to show that wealth turned to good uses was appreciated to the full by Luke and by his Lord. They were both of them glad enough that there were some women who were well-to-do and able to minister of their substance to the Master and his apostles in the days of their need. They preferred to preach and be poor themselves, but they had no prejudice against those who made money honestly if they made good use of their money when made. They loved the poor and served the poor, but they had no objection to being served by the rich if the rich offered to share any portion of their possessions with them. They were preachers of the gospel to the poor, a gospel whose message was of equal importance and value to the rich and to which the rich were equally welcome if they would hear.

7. This is *The Gospel for the Outcasts.*

There is still another class with which the physician must perforce come into professional contact, and with which the preacher and the lawyer often have little to do. That is the class of the social outcasts. It surely is characteristic of this Gospel according to Luke that its sympathy reaches even to these. Luke 6. 35, in the margin of the Revised Version, reads, Jesus despaired "of no man." That might be made the text of the entire narrative. Luke was like his Master again at this point. The brand of public infamy has no weight for him. His sympathies went out to all who were in need, even as the sympathies of Jesus always had been manifested most to those who needed them most.

In the Acts of Paul and Thecla we read that Paul said of Jesus that he was the only one who sympathized with a world gone astray. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we read that Jesus is our great High Priest, being able to sympathize with the ignorant and the erring. It is this compassionate Christ whom Luke sets before us in his pages. He is not seeking the self-satisfied, but the self-despairing. It was the sickest who had greatest need. It was those whom all others

had deserted who most needed a friend. Jesus in this Gospel is the Good Shepherd seeking for the outcast in the farthest mountains of social ostracism or willful sin. Jesus was a Jew. He had had a Jewish training. He lived always in a Jewish environment. He never had the advantage of foreign travel and he never came under the broadening influence of residence among the many races of men. Yet he never displays any Jewish narrowness or prejudice. He is interested in all men alike. No man, of whatever nationality or of whatever previous spiritual condition, is beyond his sympathy or the ready proffer of his help.

(1) This is the Gospel in which we read of the prodigal son who wastes all his living on harlots and yet is not beyond reclamation, and who comes back at last to the father's home and to the unhesitating and undiminished love of the father's heart.[168]

(2) This is the Gospel of the publican Zacchæus, generally regarded as a sinner with whom no respectable people ought to have any social dealings, but with whom Jesus went to lodge, and whom Jesus acknowledged as a son of Abraham.[169]

(3) This is the Gospel of the sinful woman with whom Simon the Pharisee would have been ashamed to show any personal acquaintance in public, but whom Jesus recognized and whose service he gladly accepted and whose sins he freely forgave.[170]

(4) This is the Gospel in which the crucified criminal, a coarse bandit who was given up by the state as a hopeless case, and was paying the penalty of his many crimes, walked straight into paradise with the sinless Lord.[171]

In this Gospel the harlot and the criminal, the prodigal and the social pariah, of whatever class or condition, are

[168] 15. 11-32.
[169] 19. 2-10.
[170] 7. 36-50.
[171] 23. 40-43.

freely offered the society and the service of the purest and the best. Do the preachers of to-day associate with these classes? Are they on terms of familiar acquaintance with them? Are they continually finding converts among them? Are they continually proving that they who are forgiven most love most, and that from these classes the most devoted saints may come? If they are not, their gospel must be somewhat different from the gospel of Luke and his Lord; or, if they have the same gospel, their ministration of it must be somewhat different.

Does not this Gospel according to Luke suggest that every Christian preacher to-day ought to know every exploiter of vice in his neighborhood and every inmate of every house of ill fame, and that a part of his ministry ought to be given to these, and that some of the chief triumphs of his ministry ought to be found among these? Surely, conditions have not so changed that we need to despair of any man or of any woman now, or that we ought to recognize any social outcasts now, to whom it is not our duty to carry the good news of salvation.

The Gospel according to Luke is the gospel of the children, the gospel of womanhood, the gospel of the poor, and the gospel of the outcast and forsaken. Of course, the other synoptics have some suggestions of these things, but they are so numerous in the third Gospel and they are so frequently found in the portions peculiar to it that they become characteristic of the narrative written by Luke. They might be accounted for altogether by his knowledge of and his sympathy with the character of Jesus, who was the friend of the little ones and the women and the poor and the publicans and sinners in all his ministry. They might be accounted for altogether by Luke's personal character and by his overflowing sympathy for all the helpless and oppressed. We have endeavored to show that in addition to these things his profession as a physician must have influenced him largely in his choice of materials for his gospel history.

The sign-manual of the physician is written large over the pages of his narrative and is apparent also in his peculiar and characteristic interest in certain classes—the women and children, the outcast and the poor. We might continue our classification of the general characteristics of the Gospel according to Luke under this general head, but we prefer to turn now from Luke the physician to Luke the companion of Paul.

8. This is *The Pauline Gospel.*

Much more nearly than the other two synoptics, the Gospel according to Luke is the Gospel according to Paul. It is but natural that the Gentile Gospel should reflect most largely the theology of the apostle to the Gentiles. Luke's close personal association with the apostle Paul must have influenced him greatly in his conceptions of the scope, the content, and the aim of the gospel message and truth. Paul was more nearly a systematic theologian than any other of the New Testament writers. Luke has managed to get much more doctrine into his Gospel narrative than the other synoptics; and the doctrine of Luke is substantially the doctrine of Paul.

Three times in his epistles Paul speaks of "my gospel." [172] Origen, Eusebius,[173] and Jerome[174] thought that Paul meant by this phrase the Gospel according to Luke. That was his gospel because it represented his point of view throughout. Irenæus[175] had written still earlier, "Luke, the companion of Paul, committed to writing the gospel preached by the latter." There is so much in common between the

---

[172] Rom. 2. 16; Rom. 16. 25; 2 Tim. 2. 8.

[173] "They say that Paul meant to refer to Luke's Gospel whenever, as if speaking of some Gospel of his own, he used the words 'according to my Gospel.'" Hist. Eccles. iii, 4.

[174] "Some suppose that whenever Paul in his Epistles makes use of the expression 'according to my Gospel' he means Luke's writing." De vir. illustr., vii.

[175] Adversus Hæreses, iii, 1. 1.

Gospel written by Luke and the gospel preached by Paul that we readily can believe that Paul's influence is manifest in Luke's writing, but we do not believe that Paul ever called the third Gospel his own in the sense that he claimed any personal responsibility for its composition. When he spoke of "my gospel" he meant only the revelation made to himself and proclaimed in his preaching. We have no reason to believe that the word "gospel" was used as a proper name in any of the New Testament writings or was applied at any time to any of the books we now call by such title.

The truth behind this tradition of Paul's personal appropriation of the third Gospel is, as Plummer says, the fact that "Paul was the illuminator of Luke (Tert. iv, 2): he enlightened him as to the essential character of the gospel. Luke, as his fellow worker, would teach what the apostle taught, and would learn to give prominence to those elements in the gospel narrative of which he made most frequent use." The old Latin proverb said, *Noscitur a sociis,* "A man is known by the company he keeps." No one could be a close companion with the apostle Paul without being influenced by him in both life and thought. We have seen that Luke was not only a companion, but a beloved physician and a congenial friend. Coleridge used to say that no one was fit to be a commentator upon the Epistles of Paul except Martin Luther, and Luther failed because he was not such a gentleman as Paul. Now, Luke was a gentleman. He had something of the innate courtesy which characterized the great apostle, and in this Gospel we find the general impress made by the character and the creed of the apostle upon such a man.

Having thus determined the nature of Luke's indebtedness to Paul, we will now look for the more specific proofs of such relationship in the writings of these two men.

1. We notice some remarkable parallelisms of expression at several points. *a.* In the account of the Lord's Supper

neither Matthew nor Mark tells us that the Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me." Luke, in 22. 19, and Paul, in 1 Cor. 11. 24, are the only ones to record it. Matthew and Mark say that the Lord said, "This is my blood of the covenant," while Paul and Luke record the words as, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."[176] Matthew and Mark connect the Eucharist, or thanksgiving, with the cup; Paul and Luke connect it with the bread. These striking differences from other accounts and close similarities between Paul and Luke would be sufficient in themselves to suggest that these two men had been associated many a time in the administration of this sacrament, and so had come to adopt the same formulation in the account of it.

b. In 1 Cor. 15. 5 Paul tells us that the risen Lord appeared to Cephas. The only other mention of this resurrection appearance in the New Testament is to be found in Luke 24. 34: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." Paul and Luke seem to have regarded this as one of the important appearances, or at least worthy of mention in any account of them. All our other authorities are utterly silent concerning it.

c. Some have thought that a threefold classification of ideas is characteristic of both Paul and Luke. We recall such passages in the Epistles of Paul, as 1 Cor. 13. 13, "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three," and that other enumeration of the essential elements in the unity of the Spirit set forth in Eph. 4. 4-6, falling into three groups of three: one body, one Spirit, one hope; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, transcendent, omnipresent, immanent, over all, through all, in all. When we turn to Luke we find him recording the three parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son together, while Matthew has the parable of the lost sheep alone.[177] Luke tells us of three would-be disciples who are turned away by

[176] Luke 22. 20; 1 Cor. 11. 25.

[177] 18. 12.

our Lord, and in the parallel passage in Matthew[178] we find mention of only two. Compare also the loaf, fish, and egg of Luke 11. 11, 12 with the bread and fish of Matt. 7. 9, 10.

d. There are many phrases common to Paul and Luke and not to be met anywhere else in the New Testament. Long lists of these have been prepared by many authorities. We suggest a few samples only among them. Compare Luke 4. 22 with Col. 4. 6, and Luke 8. 15 with Col. 1. 10, 11, and Luke 6. 39 with Rom. 2. 19, and Luke 10. 8 with 1 Cor. 10. 27, and Luke 21. 36 with Eph. 6. 18.

(2) To these parallelisms in expression we add, in the second place, a remarkable similarity in the use of single terms. For example:

a. The double title "Lord Jesus" is found nearly a hundred times in the Epistles of Paul. It is found only once in the synoptic Gospels—in Luke 24. 3.

b. The name "Lord" is applied to Jesus again and again by Paul. It is never so used in the Gospel according to Mark except by the heathen Syrophœnician woman in 7. 28. The title occurs fourteen times in Luke, and so makes another connecting link between his usage and that of Paul.

c. The proper name "Satan" is used by Paul ten times, by Luke seven times, by Mark six times, by Matthew four times, and by John only once.

d. The word "Saviour" is not found in Matthew or Mark. It occurs twice in Luke, once in John, and a multitude of times in Paul.

e. The word "salvation" is not found in Matthew or Mark. It occurs four times in Luke, once in John, on page after page in the writings of Paul.

f. The word "grace" is characteristic of Paul's most frequent and emphatic usage. It never is found in Matthew and Mark. It occurs eight times in Luke and three times in John. It is found one hundred and forty-six times in the

---

[178] 8. 19-22.

New Testament, but only twenty-one times outside the writings of Luke and Paul.

g. "Faith" is another keyword in Paul's theology. It is found in Luke eleven times, in Matthew eight, in Mark five, and in John not at all. In the book of Acts the word occurs sixteen times. It is found in the New Testament two hundred and forty-three times, but only fifty-three times outside the writings of Luke and Paul.

h. Repentance is joined with faith in the usage of Paul as one of the essentials to salvation. The word "repentance," *μετάνοια*, is found in Luke five times, in Matthew two, in Mark only once, and in John not at all. It occurs in the book of Acts six times.

i. Paul joins mercy with grace and peace in some of his salutations. The word "mercy," *ἔλεος*, is found in Luke six times, in Matthew three, and in Mark and John and the book of Acts not at all. To Luke all the perfection of God would seem to be summed up in his quality of mercy. In the Sermon on the Mount, as reported by Matthew, the climax of command is found in the words, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect," [179] but Luke chronicles the corresponding command in his Sermon on the Plain in these words, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is also merciful." [180] He who attains this height will find nothing beyond him.

We may say, in general, that Luke's vocabulary is much more Pauline than that of the other gospel writers. Luke has one hundred and one words in common with Paul which are not to be found in any other writers of the New Testament books. Matthew has only thirty-two and Mark twenty-two and John twenty-one.

(3) However, it is when we come to the doctrinal features they have in common that the relationship between the writings of Luke and Paul becomes most apparent.

[179] Matt. 5. 48.
[180] 6. 36.

a. The third Gospel furnishes the historical background for just such teaching and preaching as that of the great apostle of the Gentiles, Paul. In its narrative Israel is rejected and the way is opened for the reception of the Gentiles into the kingdom of God just as clearly as in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. (a) In the first sermon in the ministry of Jesus he made it apparent to his fellow townsmen in Nazareth that the heathen might enjoy the blessings they were ready to despise.[181] (b) In the middle of his ministry Jesus answers the question, "Are there few that be saved?" by declaring, "They shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God; but ye yourselves shall be cast forth without." [182] (c) At the close of his ministry Jesus told his disciples that it was written that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations.[183] From the beginning to the end the Gentiles are included within the scope of the gospel salvation.

b. In thorough consistency with this fundamental position we find a spirit of wide-reaching and all-inclusive tolerance characterizing this Gospel even as it did the preaching of Paul. See how this is apparent in the attitude of Jesus as pictured here toward the Samaritans. The Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans. They considered them even worse than Gentile dogs. (a) When the Samaritan villagers showed themselves inhospitable James and John were ready to call down fire from heaven upon them, in the spirit of Elijah. But Jesus declared that the intolerant spirit of Elijah was not the spirit of the gospel he had come to preach. That gospel would include and in due time would win the Samaritans as well as the Jews.[184] (b) Again,

[181] 4. 24-27.
[182] 13. 23-29.
[183] 24. 47.
[184] 9. 52-55.

when ten lepers were healed and only one returned to give thanks unto God, both Jesus and the evangelist call attention to the fact that the one grateful man was a Samaritan stranger.[185] (c) Again, in the Master's parable of the one who proved himself neighbor to the man who fell among thieves he chose as the hero of that tale no Jewish priest or Levite, but a good Samaritan.[186] It is in the third Gospel alone that we find these three references to the Samaritans, and they all breathe the spirit of tolerance and friendliness which was to characterize a gospel preached to and for all men.

c. The emphatic and persistent presentation of the personality of the Holy Spirit is characteristic of both Luke and Paul. Where Matthew reads, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" [187], Luke sums up all good things in that one greatest gift of the Father to men and says, "How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" [188] In the third Gospel we find eighteen references to the Holy Spirit, thirteen of them in four chapters; and in the whole of Matthew there are only twelve, and in Mark only six. Luke therefore has as many as Matthew and Mark combined.

If we were to name the three features in which the doctrinal teaching of Luke and Paul are most alike, we would mention: (1) The universal scope of the gospel, because of the marvelous grace and all-inclusive love shown by God to men. (2) The importance of the work of the Holy Spirit. (3) The emphasis laid upon the real humanity of Jesus. We turn next to consider this characteristic of the Gospel according to Luke.

---

[185] 17. 11-19.
[186] 10. 30-37.
[187] Matt. 7. 11.
[188] Luke 11. 13.

It is the Gospel of the real humanity of Jesus. It is the Gospel of Jesus as our Brother-Man. It is the Gospel of the Kinsman-Redeemer of the race. Here for the first time in the New Testament we meet the word "redemption"—"He hath visited and wrought redemption for his people," Zacharias sings.[189] We are told that Anna spoke of Jesus to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.[190] The two disheartened disciples on their way to Emmaus said, "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel."[191] Redemption by a genuine incarnation—that is the great theme of this Gospel.

9. This is *The Gospel of Jesus, our Brother-Man.*

(1) *In early life.* It begins by showing that the birth and infancy and childhood of Jesus were those of any normal human life. *a.* Luke alone tells us about the poverty of the surroundings into which the baby boy came, born of a woman, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, wrapped in the swaddling clothes and laid in the stable straw.[192]

b. Luke tells us that he was circumcised like every other Jewish boy.[193] It was the first shedding of redeeming blood. It was his first external identification with the religious life of his race.

c. Luke also tells us about his presentation in the temple.[194] Born under the law, it became him to fulfill all righteousness.

d. Luke records the fact that the child Jesus grew as every other child grew, increasing in size and increasing in strength, and correspondingly increasing in wisdom as the days and the years went by.[195] The boy Jesus is neither omniscient nor omnipotent, but just a normal, natural, healthy, and growing boy, according to Luke.

e. Luke tells us how Jesus went up to Jerusalem to cele-

[189] 1. 68.
[190] 2. 38.
[191] 24. 21.
[192] 2. 4-7.
[193] 2. 21.
[194] 2. 22.
[195] 2. 40.

brate his first passover as a son of the Law, and how he sat in the temple in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them, and asking them questions.[196]

f. Luke adds that through all his minority in the home at Nazareth Jesus was subject to his parents, as any lad would be expected to be.[197]

g. Then, lest anyone should think that the youth of Jesus was not like his childhood or like the youth of any other lad in its gradual development of all its powers, Luke tells us again that Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.[198] It is Luke alone who has given us this information concerning the babe and the boy and the youth, and he has shown us that Jesus was just like us in his human birth and growth, glorifying babyhood and obedient childhood by entering fully into their estate.

(2) *At the close of life.* When we turn to the close of the narrative we find that Luke is very careful to show us how Jesus is very human at every point. *a.* Luke tells us that when Jesus wept over Jerusalem he wept audibly, sobbing aloud in his profound grief, genuinely human and pitiful.[199] He wept at the grave of Lazarus, but there he wept silently. John has recorded that weeping,[200] but neither John nor Luke nor any other evangelist has ever recorded the fact that Jesus laughed. He was a "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief"; but he must have had some moments of relaxation. We feel sure that he must have smiled many and many a time, and it would be strange indeed if there were not occasions when he was provoked into hearty laughter. He entered so thoroughly into sympathy with the joys as well as the sorrows of those who were his friends that he must have laughed with them sometimes. The picture of normal boyhood which Luke presents in this Gospel would be incomplete if we were not allowed to

[196] 2. 42-46.
[197] 2. 51.
[198] 2. 52.
[199] 19. 41-44.
[200] John 11. 35.

imagine in it certain moments of unrestrained merriment in the enjoyment of innocent fun. We think that he would have been more likely to pipe and dance and laugh with the other children of Nazareth in their games in the market place than to join in any funeral performances or mock-mourning. His youth was a happy one, but he became a Man of sorrows, and as he treads the thorny path to the cross with suffering and tears Luke shows us that he was very man at every step.

b. Luke records that an angel appeared to him in Gethsemane, strengthening him.[201] Truly man, he needed heavenly aid.

c. Luke alone tells us of the extremity of human weakness and physical agony through which Jesus passed in Gethsemane, in which "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground." [202]

d. Luke alone tells us that in that Gethsemane arrest Jesus called himself again by his favorite title by means of which he so continually identified himself with the human race and proclaimed his brotherhood with all other men, for he said, "Judas, betrayest thou *the Son of man* with a kiss?" [203]

e. Luke has the record that in utter human dependence upon the Father in the hour and article of death he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." [204]

f. Luke alone tells us that the centurion who stood by and saw him suffer and die was so impressed that "he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was *a righteous man*." [205]

g. Luke tells us that after his resurrection, in the appearance to the assembled disciples on that first Easter evening, Jesus sought to convince them that his incarnate humanity had survived death and the grave, and that his human identity was unimpaired. He said to them, "See my hands

---

[201] 22. 43.
[202] 22. 44.
[203] 22. 48.
[204] 23. 46.
[205] 23. 47.

and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having." Then he took a piece of broiled fish "and ate before them."[206] As at the beginning of his life, so at the close of his life, Luke insists upon the Lord's real humanity. There is no human weakness or limitation in which Jesus does not share. He is one with us in everything but sin; and he was one with us after the resurrection and in the ascension as well.

In his birth and early life Luke has shown us that the Lord was really and truly man. Through the closing days and in his death Luke has made it equally clear that Jesus was genuinely human to the last. How about the years of his active ministry? To us there is no better proof of the real and genuine humanity of Jesus than his prayers afford us; and no one of the evangelists has emphasized the Lord's need and practice of prayer as Luke has. Through all his ministry he shows us the man Jesus continually exercising the grace of true spiritual dependence. Luke repeatedly tells us that Jesus was praying when the other evangelists say nothing about it.

(3) *In the life of prayer.* *a.* We read in the other Gospels about the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan, but Luke alone tells us that it was as Jesus was being baptized *and praying* that the heaven was opened for the descent of the Holy Spirit and the witness of the heavenly Voice.[207]

b. We read in some of the other Gospels about the cleansing of the leper and the immediately succeeding collision with the religious authorities. Luke alone tells us that between these two events Jesus withdrew himself into the deserts *and prayed*.[208]

c. We read in the other Gospels of the choice of the twelve. Luke tells us that that choice was made in the

[206] 24. 39-43.
[207] 3. 21.
[208] 5. 16.

early morning, after Jesus had continued *in prayer all night long* upon the mountain alone.[209]

d. Luke tells us that it was after Jesus had been *praying apart* that Peter made the great confession, and Jesus answered it with his first prediction of his own future suffering and certain murder.[210]

e. Others tell us about the transfiguration experience, but Luke alone informs us that Jesus had gone up into that mountain *to pray,* and that *as he was praying* the fashion of his countenance was altered, and he was transfigured before the disciples' eyes.[211]

f. Matthew records the prayer prescribed for the disciples, "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name," as a part of the Sermon on the Mount. Luke alone tells us that this prayer was first given when Jesus had been *praying in a certain place,* and when he ceased one of his disciples had asked him, "Lord, wilt thou teach us to pray?" [212]

g. Luke tells us that Jesus said to Peter, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I *made supplication for thee,* that thy faith fail not." [213]

h. Luke records that Jesus prayed on the cross, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."[214]

i. Luke adds that Jesus made his last breath a breath of prayer. He cried with a loud voice, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, he gave up the ghost." [215]

Jesus needed to pray just as much as we need to pray. He prayed to God for strength because he needed strength. He prayed to God for guidance because he needed guidance. He prayed to God for knowledge because he needed enlightenment. He prayed for miracle-working power, and it was

---

[209] 6. 12, 13.
[210] 9. 18-22.
[211] 9. 28, 29.
[212] 11. 1-4.
[213] 22. 31, 32.
[214] 23. 34.
[215] 23. 46.

granted him in answer to his holy prayer. He asked for the Holy Spirit, and by his aid he lived a holy life. He is our perfect Pattern in prayer. He is our Prince of faith. Luke has emphasized this fact as no other New Testament writer has. We are not surprised, therefore, that he not only has given us the example of Jesus in the practice of the prayer life, but he also has preserved for us some additional instruction given by Jesus concerning prayer.

a. Luke alone tells us that Jesus spoke a parable to the end that men ought always to pray and not to faint.[216]

b. He tells us that Jesus in that parable declared that the elect of God cry to him day and night.[217]

c. Luke alone gives us those three prayer parables of Jesus, the importunate friend,[218] the importunate widow,[219] and the pompously praying Pharisee and the piously praying publican.[220] They all teach by contrast. You do not need to pray like the importunate friend, for you pray to a Father in heaven who is not asleep in bed and who is more ready to give than you are to ask. You do not need to behave like that importunate widow, for you do not pray to an unjust judge, but to a loving Father who will avenge you speedily. You must not pray like that self-announcing Pharisee, but like the self-denouncing and self-renouncing publican.

d. Matthew 25. 13 and Mark 13. 33 tell us that the Lord exhorted the disciples to "watch" in view of the coming perils and trials of the church; but Luke adds "at every season, *making supplication*, that ye may prevail." [221]

e. Luke alone tells us that when they had come to the garden of Gethsemane Jesus exhorted the disciple band, "*Pray* that ye enter not into temptation." [222] It was only after having given this final warning and command that he

---

[216] 18. 1.
[217] 18. 7.
[218] 11. 5-9.
[219] 18. 1-8.
[220] 18. 9-14.
[221] 21. 36.
[222] 22. 40.

went on into his own spiritual wrestling and final victory through prayer.

If the disciples of Jesus had learned to pray as their Master prayed, their victory would have been as sure and as continuous as his own. He was their Master in the practice and the precept of prayer, as in everything else. Luke recognizes him as such. That title "Master," ἐπιστάτης, is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament. He alone records the fact that the disciples gave this name to Jesus; and in the third Gospel we find it seven times.[223]

(4) *In social life.* It is characteristic of the third Gospel that it pictures Jesus as entering into all the social relations of life. Much more frequently than the other evangelists Luke tells us how Jesus was entertained in private homes, was invited to dinners, and sat at meat with various hosts and sometimes with many guests; and much of the teaching which Matthew represents Jesus as giving in public discourses we find Luke recording in connection with these social events.

a. Luke tells us that a certain Simon, a Pharisee, invited Jesus to eat with him, but neglected to show him the usual courtesies offered to guests, and when Jesus was anointed by the sinful woman Simon was told the parable of the two debtors, and was thus gently rebuked.[224]

b. Luke tells us of the reception in the house of Martha and Mary, and of Martha's ministration to the bodily needs of the company while Mary ministered to the Master's wearied soul.[225]

c. Luke tells us how another Pharisee asked Jesus to dine with him, and while they were sitting at the table Jesus uttered that scathing rebuke of Pharisaical hypocrisy and sin.[226] Evidently Jesus did not consider the acceptance of

[223] 5. 5; 8. 24; 8. 45; 9. 33; 9. 49; 17. 13.
[224] 7. 36-50.
[225] 10. 38-42.
[226] 11. 37-52.

any man's hospitality a sufficient reason for blinking any man's sin.

d. Luke alone tells us that on a certain Sabbath Jesus was dining in the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees, and it was there that the cure of the dropsical man took place.[227] When he saw those who were bidden choosing the chief seats he rebuked their selfishness.[228] He told his host that he ought not to invite such people to dinner, but he would be blessed if he would invite only the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind.[229] Then he spoke the parable of the great supper, the invitation to which was slighted by the guests first bidden, and to which the people filling the highways and the hedges were constrained to come.[230]

e. By Luke only we are told of the joyful hospitality given to Jesus in the home of Zacchæus and the glad issue in salvation to that house.[231]

f. By Luke alone we are told of his breaking bread in the home of the two disciples at Emmaus, and of their recognition of him in the familiar manner of his doing it.[232] The table manners of Jesus must have been well known in many a humble home in Palestine.

In all the instances we have mentioned Luke alone has preserved the picture of the entertainment of Jesus by private persons in their homes. We learn from these narratives that Jesus did not refuse an invitation to dinner upon the Sabbath day, but, on the contrary, on that day and every day he seems to have accepted without hesitation the proffered hospitality of rich and poor, of friends and foes. We learn, too, that he was just as faithful to his ministry on these social occasions as he was in the synagogues or at any other place. People had their sins forgiven while he sat at dinner. Salvation came to the home in which he was

[227] 14. 1-6.
[228] 14. 7-11.
[229] 14. 12-14.
[230] 14. 15-24.
[231] 19. 6-9.
[232] 24. 30, 31.

entertained. Some of his most stinging rebukes were administered to those who sat at meat with him. Some of his most precious parables and teachings were first given on these social occasions.

g. In the parables peculiar to the third Gospel there are many glimpses of home life, showing how our Lord had been observant of many domestic experiences. The master of the house who rises up and shuts to the door and makes all safe for the night, the neighbor who comes knocking loudly at midnight and asking to borrow a few loaves of bread, the woman raising a great dust and upsetting the whole house until she finds the lost coin, the great banquet with music and dancing to celebrate the prodigal's return—all these things Luke lets us know that the Lord had seen and had made note of for use in his preaching. In the parable of the mustard seed Mark says that the seed was sown in the earth,[233] and Matthew says in the field,[234] but Luke says that a man sowed it in his own garden.[235]

10. This is *The Gospel of Praise.*

We close this list of the characteristics of the third Gospel by noting some of the things which recall the personality of the author with his sunny disposition which made him beloved, and caused his praise to be sung in all the churches.

(1) The narrative begins and it ends with worship in the temple. The first picture we see is that of the multitude of the people praying at the hour of incense,[236] and the last picture shown us is that of the band of disciples, spending their time continually in the temple praising God.[237]

(2) The first chapters are filled with hymns of praise. We find there the Magnificat, the song of Mary;[238] the Benedictus, the song of Zacharias;[239] the Ave Maria, the angel's salutation;[240] the Gloria in Excelsis, the song of the

---

[233] 4. 31.
[234] 13. 31.
[235] 13. 19.
[236] 1. 10.
[237] 24. 53.
[238] 1. 46-55.
[239] 1. 68-79.
[240] 1. 28-33.

angels;[241] and the Nunc Dimittis, the song of Simeon.[242] Schaff says of these: "They are the last of Hebrew psalms, as well as the first of Christian hymns. They can be literally translated back into the Hebrew without losing their beauty." [243]

They evidently belong to just this border line between the two dispensations. They are much more like the ancient psalms than the later Christian hymns are wont to be. They have just enough of the dawning light of the new order to distinguish them from the songs written before the Dayspring from on high had visited God's people. The Jewish forms and figures are used to express a new hope and a new joy. The promise made to Abraham is fulfilled. It is the house of David which is to be blessed. It is the glory of the house of Israel which is revealed. But redemption is wrought; salvation has come; the day has dawned; the whole heaven is lit up with hope; the whole heart is filled with peace. These are Christian hymns, but there is an indefiniteness about them which marks them as belonging to the very beginning. There is no redemption by blood. There is no forecasting of the cross. These things came in later. They do not belong here in the first joy that light has shined upon those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death.

This Gospel begins with songs and ends with songs, and there is singing and rejoicing all the way along. The Gospel according to Matthew began with the wailing at Bethlehem for the children who were no more and it ended with sevenfold "Woes" upon the Pharisees who would not be saved. In the Gospel according to Luke the saints are singing from the beginning to the close. Bishop Alexander said of the Magnificat: "It is the highest specimen of the subtle influence of the song of purity, so exquisitely described by

[241] 2. 14.
[242] 2. 29-32.
[243] Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 665.

Browning. It is the Pippa Passes among the liturgies of the world."[244] What he has said of Mary's song we might well say of the entire Gospel. It is a message whose melody has transformed the hearts of men.

(3) More often than in any other Gospel we are told that those who received special benefits glorified God for them. Matthew and Mark note this fact occasionally, but Luke notes it again and again.[245] Plummer calls our attention further to the fact that the expression "praising God" [246] is almost peculiar to Luke in the New Testament. The phrase "blessing God" found in Luke 1. 64; 2. 28 occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in James 3. 9. The phrase, "to give praise to God," is found only in Luke 18. 43.

(4) In the two books of Matthew and Mark the noun "joy" occurs seven times, while in Luke and Acts it is found thirteen times. In Matthew and Mark the verb "to rejoice" occurs eight times, while in Luke and Acts it is found nineteen times. Do not these facts suggest that Luke was about twice as joyful as the ordinary man, and that he was praising God and glorifying God so continually that it seemed to him to be the natural thing to do?

(5) The ministry of angels to Jesus and to the disciples is emphasized more frequently in the third Gospel than in any of the others; and angels are mentioned twenty-two times in the book of Acts. The angel Gabriel stands at the entrance to this Gospel, as the messenger of God to both Zacharias and Mary, foretelling the birth of both John the Forerunner and Jesus the Messiah. An angel appears to the shepherds with the good news of the Saviour's birth and then a whole choir of the heavenly host sings for great joy. At the time of the great confession Jesus promised that the Son of man would come "in his own glory, and the glory of

---

[244] Alexander, The Leading Ideas of the Gospels, p. 114.

[245] *2.* 20; 5. 25, 26; 7. 16; 13. 13; 17. 15; 18. 43.

[246] *2.* 13; *2.* 20; 19. 37; 24. 53; and Acts *2.* 47; 3. 8; 3. 9.

the Father, and of the holy angels."[247] He told his disciples, "Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God."[248]

He told the disciples about the woman who found the lost coin, and then added, "Even so, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."[249] He declared that those who attain to the resurrection from the dead are equal to the angels, and die no more.[250] In the wilderness of temptation the devil quoted the promise of the psalm to Jesus: "He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to guard thee,"[251] and in the garden of agony that promise was fulfilled, for Luke records that "there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him."[252] As the Virgin had had her angelic vision in the beginning, so the holy women have their vision of angels at the tomb.[253] Here and there throughout the Gospel we hear echoes of angel songs and catch glimpses of angel wings. The whole narrative is brightened with their presence and their praise.

VI. The Gospel and the Man Luke

Our knowledge of the man helps us in our study of the Gospel, for we find that the characteristics of the man are the characteristics of the book. Some men may have the power of concealing their own personality in their writings, as Shakespeare had. We can learn little or nothing about Shakespeare himself by reading his plays. Most men, however, write their own characters into the pro-

[247] 9. 26.
[248] 12. 8, 9.
[249] 15. 10.
[250] 20. 36.
[251] 4. 10.
[252] 22. 43. The passage is of somewhat doubtful authenticity.
[253] 24. 23.

ductions of their pen. Charles Lamb put his own genial disposition into the Essays of Elia. Thomas Carlyle put his own crabbed self into his pamphlets and criticisms and histories and prophecies. As we read them we know what sort of a man wrote them. They are self-revealing. Carlyle could not write another man's biography without writing his autobiography between the lines. No more could Luke. He writes the biography of the Perfect Life, but he writes it out of a heart in perfect sympathy with that transcendent Life. He has a most beautiful subject with which to deal, but the subject alone would never have enabled him to make the most beautiful book ever written. That Life Beautiful had to be written into a Book Beautiful by a soul beautiful as they.

It was Herder who suggested that Luke "might be called the evangelist of Philanthropy," and he thought that such a Gospel as this was "in keeping with the character of a man who had made numerous journeys among the Greeks and Romans with Paul, and who dedicated his writings to a Theophilus." [254] It was such a book as a lover of men would write for a lover of God.

Therefore we never shall cease to be thankful that, although many others had taken in hand to write a narrative of these matters before him, Luke felt constrained to say, "It seemed good to me also, most excellent Theophilus, to write these things for thee accurately and in order." The personality revealed in that phrase, "me also," finds explicit mention in that first sentence of preface and dedication alone; but the influence of that personality is apparent to all who have eyes to see, and who will take the trouble to look for it, in every following page of the Gospel. Dante called Luke "the writer of the story of the gentleness of Christ," [255] and only a gentle and lovable spirit could have written a story so beautiful in style and in content as this.

[254] Herder, Vom Erlöser der Menchen, p. 218.

[255] De Monarchia, i, 16.

Ian MacLaren has said, "There are times when one wishes he had never read the New Testament Scriptures—that he might some day open the Gospel according to Luke, and the most beautiful book in the world might come upon his soul like sunrise." Has anyone ever been able to read this Gospel through without feeling that a dayspring from on high had visited him, to shine upon those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death, and to guide his feet into the way of peace? Can anyone read it now without feeling the gospel sunshine flooding his life?

PART IV

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

PART IV

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

I. Definitions

It will be well to define our terms first of all. 1. The Gospels are the four narratives of the life of Christ found in our New Testament. 2. *The synoptic Gospels* are the first three Gospels as distinguished from the fourth. They are given this title because they present the same general view of the life of Christ. According to the composition of the Greek word *σύνοψις*, they "view" that life "together." They resemble each other sufficiently to form a related group. The fourth Gospel is so peculiar that it cannot be put into this group. Expressed in homely phrase, the synoptic Gospels are like birds of a feather which flock together: the fourth Gospel is like an eagle which flies alone.

3. *The Synoptic Problem* is furnished in the fact that while the first three Gospels remarkably resemble each other in general, they strangely differ with each other in particulars. Written in parallel columns they present curiously intermingled phenomena of apparent originality and seeming plagiarism. At various points each appears to be independent, while in other places all appear to be interdependent. Their narratives of incidents and discourses now approach each other, now coalesce, now separate, are now identical and now different. Their relationship is sometimes clear and sometimes obscure. It is like a series of dissolving pictures in which one unexpectedly replaces the other; and it is difficult to define the beginning or the end of any of them. There must be some reason for these things. There must be some explanation for these shifting phenomena.

Why are there these parallelisms and these divergences? Why are the synoptics so like each other and yet so unlike? The Problem of the Synoptic Gospels is to find a satisfactory and a sufficient answer to these questions. It is the most difficult problem of present-day New Testament criticism. Possibly as much has been written about it as about any other problem in the history of literature, but it has not been solved as yet. It is the Great Enigma of the beginning of our New Testament canon as the Apocalypse is the Great Enigma of its close. All of the solutions of the Synoptic Problem thus far offered are largely guesses in the dark. None of them is absolutely satisfactory. None of them may be more than partly right.

In some places the synoptics are identical in their statements. In other places they are like each other. In still other places they differ with each other. In a few instances they contradict each other. These are the facts. What theory of their origin will account for these facts? That is our problem. We will look at it a little more closely now.

II. Resemblances

Professor Sanday has said, "Taking the three Gospels together, in all their elements, the total impression which they convey is essentially harmonious and consistent." [1] All will agree that this is true. The synoptics tell the same story and they tell it in much the same way. They resemble each other not only in general but also in various minor particulars.

1. There is an occasional absolute identity of language. This is never very extensive, but it is sufficiently striking when it occurs.

(1) In one quotation from the Old Testament, found in all of the synoptists, in the original the identity of language reaches through fifteen consecutive words. Here Matthew

[1] Expository Times, xx, p. 113.

and Mark agree in saying, "The Lord said to my lord, Sit upon my right hand, until I may place thy enemies under thy feet," and Luke agrees with them for fifteen words, but diverges from them in the end in order to agree with the Septuagint which reads, "until I may place thy enemies as the footstool of thy feet." [2] Another striking instance of agreement between the three synoptists through fourteen consecutive words is in their quotation from Isaiah, "A voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight," and it is remarkable that in this case they all agree in misquoting the Septuagint which reads, "Make straight the paths of our God," and this is the correct rendering of the Hebrew original.[3]

(2) In one case in the narrative portion of the synoptists absolute identity, including the order of the words in the original Greek, extends through the twelve words, "the five loaves, and the two fishes, having looked up to heaven, he blessed." [4] In no case in the narratives does such agreement extend through more than twelve words, and it seldom goes beyond four or six words.

(3) In reporting the sayings of Jesus the synoptists will sometimes agree in as many as eight successive words, but there are not half a dozen instances where absolute agreement is maintained through five consecutive words. If they all quoted from the Old Testament the same text and the same passage, and if they all quoted correctly, we would have an absolute agreement at these points. Such absolute agreement never is found. If they all reported the same words of Jesus and reported them exactly, we would have perfect agreement in these portions of their narratives. Such agreement never occurs, extending through more than eight consecutive words. This is a strange fact. How can we account for these resemblances in absolute identity of

[2] Matt. 22. 44; Mark 12. 36; Luke 20. 42, 43.
[3] Matt. 3. 3; Mark 1. 3; Luke 3. 4.
[4] Matt. 14. 19; Mark 6. 41; Luke 9. 16.

phraseology, extending for a short measure only and then ceasing suddenly and for no apparent good reason?

2. There are certain very peculiar words found in our New Testament. Possibly the most puzzling of them all is the word ἐπιούσιος, translated "daily" in the so-called Lord's Prayer, in the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread." No one ever has been certain that that word was rightly translated. No one is sure of its meaning to-day. Scholarship always has been divided upon the question. No sufficient data exist upon the basis of which one may come to any final conclusion. The word is not found in ancient literature before the time of the New Testament. It occurs in only this one connection in the New Testament. It never is found in later literature, except in quotations from this source. The Greek and Latin Fathers never could agree upon its meaning, and modern scholars have no reason to agree which they had not.

Now, if such a rare and absolutely unique expression as this were found in only one of our synoptists we might think that he had coined it for his own use; but strangely enough this strange word is found in both Matthew and Luke. How can we account for that fact? Did Jesus use some Aramaic term which had been translated into this unusual Greek expression by some one not well acquainted with the language and did both Matthew and Luke repeat this oral or written translation? At many other points we come upon peculiarities of language which are common to two or to three of the synoptists and suggest a common source and raise the same question.

3. Sometimes a narrative is told in the same method by the three synoptists, when that method is not one which naturally would occur to three independent writers. Take the account of the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum for an example. The synoptists all tell us how Jesus turned upon the scribes on that occasion and how in the midst of his address to them he suddenly halted in the middle of a

sentence and turned to the paralytic and commanded him to rise and go home. At the same point they all insert the same parenthesis, "Then saith he to the sick of the palsy," "He saith to the sick of the palsy," "He said unto him that was palsied."[5] It is remarkable that the three should insert the parenthesis at exactly the same place in the broken narrative. That one writer independently should choose this method of telling the story would be possible. That two should agree in it independently would seem improbable. That three should do so is next to impossible.

In the account of the cure of the Gerasene demoniac there is a similar parenthesis, thrown in to explain what has gone before. First we have the demoniac's plea, "I adjure thee by God, torment me not," and then the reason for that adjuration is appended: "For he said unto him, Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man." In Mark and in Luke we have the same inverted order, first the remonstrance and then the command which caused it.[6] The natural order of narration would have been to give the command first and the resulting remonstrance afterward. That one should choose to invert the order would seem strange. That two should agree in doing it independently would seem most improbable. Other such instances might be given. They all go to prove that these stories for some reason or another had taken a stereotyped form, which is reproduced by each narrator.

4. In the main the synoptists follow the same order of events. They resemble each other in the chronological arrangement of their material. Sometimes we have a series of events in one of them, leading up to a crisis in the career of Jesus, and then suddenly we seem to lose the thread of the narrative; and we turn to another of the synoptists to see what happened next, only to find that he has failed us at the very same point. Then we turn to the third, sure that

[5] Matt. 9. 6; Mark 2. 11; Luke 5. 24.
[6] Mark 5. 7, 8; Luke 8. 28, 29.

one at least will tell us what we so much would like to know, and we find that the same period of silence intervenes in his narrative at exactly the same juncture of events. Then after a certain interval of days or months the three will take up the story again at exactly the same point. That is what we mean by saying that the synoptists in general have the same order. That order would seem to be fixed in the Gospel according to Mark. Frequently when Matthew diverges from the order of Mark, Luke will be found to agree with Mark, and, on the other hand when Luke diverges from Mark's order at any point, Matthew frequently will follow Mark in that place. Matthew and Luke never agree in transposing the order of Mark.

5. What has just been said leads us to the next statement, that the synoptists strangely agree in the selection of their material. The life of Jesus was the most interesting and the most remarkable life ever known to the race. It was only thirty-three years in length; but out of those superlatively important years our Gospels possibly give us incidents from only forty days. There must have been many other days just as full of interest and excitement as those which they have recorded. Out of the multitudes of the days why have they decided to tell us about only forty of them? If one had chosen these forty days for his record, why did not another choose forty other days just as wonderful, and the third enrich our knowledge with the account of still new and equally marvelous material? It is a strange fact that they should choose for the most part to tell us about the same things. They all mention the fact that there were many other unrecorded miracles, and yet each of the synoptists tells about much the same list of miracles which is to be found in the others. When we turn from the synoptists to John we find a new list of miracles there, and we see at once that these new miracles were just as important as, or possibly in some cases even more important than, any to be found in the synoptists. The greatest of all the miracles,

the raising of Lazarus from the dead, is found in the fourth Gospel alone. No one of our synoptists has mentioned it.

The closing statement in the fourth Gospel is to the effect that there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, it might be supposed that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written.[7] There was an abundance of material known to the eyewitnesses of the ministry of the Lord which is now lost forever. Why did not our synoptists do as the author of the fourth Gospel did and each of them give us an original and fresh putting of the life of Jesus, with fresh material chosen from this inexhaustible abundance of supply, instead of telling the same story over in much the same way?

We know so little of what Jesus did. We should like to know so much more. We know so little of what Jesus said. We would esteem every added word we could be assured fell from his lips as an invaluable treasure. Yet all the recorded sayings of Jesus could be spoken in six hours. What a meager measure of the words of life that is! Six hours of golden speech and over all the rest of the life a pall of perfect silence! We have learned to content ourselves with what we have, and yet why did our synoptists choose to give us so much common material when each of them might have added much which would have been peculiar to him and thus have made us so much the richer in our possession of the facts concerning the life and the truths enunciated in the teachings of Jesus?

The synoptists resemble each other, sometimes in absolute identity of expression, sometimes in peculiarities of language, sometimes in the method followed in an individual narration, and in general in the order of their chronicle and in the selection of their facts. What reason is there for these likenesses? The individuality of each of the evangelists has been overruled by some external fact to produce

[7] John 21. 25.

these conformities to one model and these uniformities of result.

III. Differences

To get the Synoptic Problem clearly before us we also must look at the differences between them. It would be comparatively easy to account for their resemblances on the ground of the influence of an external and controlling norm, but the problem becomes more complicated when we take their differences into consideration. The question at once arises, If there were any such controlling norm as their resemblances would indicate, why has it not controlled more completely? What reason can be suggested for such divergences as we shall now consider?

1. They differ in the transposition of sentences and paragraphs in the account both of incidents and of sayings in the life of Jesus. For example, Matthew gives the order of the temptations of Jesus in the wilderness as, first, the turning of stones into bread; and, second, the casting of himself down from the pinnacle of the temple; and, third, the worshiping of Satan for the kingdoms of the world. Luke gives us the same story of the temptation, but he puts the third of Matthew's list of temptations second and the second he puts last. There is no apparent reason for such a transposition. If this narrative were intended to be taken as a literal narrative of facts, then of course both Matthew and Luke could not be correct in their order of the events.[8]

In Matthew's narrative Jesus prophesies that the men of Nineveh shall condemn the men of his generation and then goes on to say the same thing of the queen of the south. Luke repeats these sayings but reverses their order.[9] In the account of the Last Supper Mark and Matthew tell about the giving of the bread and then the giving of the cup to the disciples. Luke introduces a giving of the cup before

[8] Matt. 4. 1-11; Luke 4. 1-13.

[9] Matt. 12. 41, 42; Luke 11. 31, 32.

the breaking of the bread and connects with it some of the language assigned by the other synoptists to the cup given after the supper.[10] These seem to be strange and unexpected and unaccountable divergences. Can any one give any sufficient and satisfactory explanation of them?

2. There are strange omissions in each of the synoptists. If they were following a common source, how are we to account for them? We understand that Luke was a Gentile, and that he took every opportunity to emphasize any portion of the teaching of Jesus which made clear the fact that his gospel was a gospel for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews. If that be true, how does it happen that Mark tells us that Jesus taught the people in the temple, saying, "Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the Gentiles," and Luke repeats the saying, "My house shall be a house of prayer," but omits the significant phrase "for all the Gentiles"?[11] We would have supposed that Luke would be sure to put that in, yet he omits it.

In Mark we read, "The gospel must first be preached unto all the Gentiles," and in Matthew we read the same statement, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the Gentiles." Then we turn to Luke and we find that he gives the same discourse of Jesus concerning the last things and Luke's account parallels that of Mark and Matthew at almost every point, and yet, strangely enough, when we come to this statement concerning the preaching of the gospel to all of the Gentiles we find that Luke omits it.[12] We would have thought that there was no saying in that discourse which Luke would have been so eager to record as that one. How can we explain such an omission? In Mark 7. 31 we are told that Jesus made a journey through the Gentile cities of Decapolis, and Mark gives some account of the things which

[10] Matt. 26. 26-29; Mark 14. 22-25; Luke 22. 17-19.
[11] Mark. 11. 17; Luke 19. 46.
[12] Mark 13. 10; Matt. 24. 14; Luke 21. 8-19.

happened there. Luke omits all mention of this journey and of these things. How strange that is! He must have been interested in these happenings in a very special degree, since he was in all probability a Gentile. Why does he make no mention of them?

Compare what Matthew calls the Sermon on the Mount with what Luke calls the Sermon on the Plain. They seem to be the same discourse. Yet Matthew says that Jesus *went up* into the *mountain* and *sat down* to preach that sermon, and Luke says that Jesus *came down* and *stood* on a *level place* while he talked.[13] In Matthew the sermon begins with eight beatitudes. In Luke there are but four, corresponding to Matthew's first, second, fourth, and eighth; and the first three of these seem to be so materially changed that we scarcely can recognize their spiritual character. Then Luke adds four woes corresponding to his four beatitudes, which have no parallel in Matthew. What seems to be a single discourse in Matthew we find to be scattered in fragments throughout Luke's narrative from the sixth to the sixteenth chapters. Following the order of the discourse in Matthew, we find the corresponding sayings in Luke first in the sixth chapter, then in the sixteenth, then in the twelfth, then in the sixth, then in the eleventh, then in the twelfth, then in the eleventh, then in the sixteenth, then in the twelfth, then in the sixth, then in the eleventh, then in the sixth, then in the thirteenth, then in the sixth, then in the thirteenth, then in the sixth again. Has Luke given us the proper setting for these several fragments of discourse, or did Jesus repeat himself and gather up into one discourse what he had said on several other occasions? Shall we trust Matthew alone, or Luke alone, or both?

3. A third difference is in the insertion of long narratives. The best example is to be found in what is usually called "the greater insertion" in Luke. In the middle of his nar-

---

[13] Matt. 5. 1; Luke 6. 17.

rative Luke has given us a large section, the most of the material in which is peculiar to him.[14] The other Gospels pass these events over in silence, and yet some of them are among the most remarkable in our Lord's ministry. Altogether about three fifths of the contents of Luke are not to be found in the other Gospels. Stroud made a mathematical presentation of the facts in his familiar table. If the contents of the several Gospels be represented by 100, then Mark has 7 peculiarities and 93 coincidences. Matthew has 42 peculiarities and 58 coincidences. Luke has 59 peculiarities and 41 coincidences.[15] This table shows that in Mark there is very little which is not paralleled in the other Gospels, more than half of the contents of Matthew is repeated in the other synoptics, and more than two fifths of the contents of Luke. Nevertheless it remains true that in each of the Gospels there are insertions of narratives and discourses not to be found in the others.

4. There are puzzling differences in the report of the same incident or the same saying. In the storm on the lake the disciples wake Jesus with a cry of terror. Mark reports it, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" Matthew says they said, "Save, Lord; we perish"; and Luke changes it again, "Master, master, we perish."[16] These are not important differences. We note them simply as examples of the slight changes in the narratives found on every page. In the saying of Jesus, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle," we find one word for "eye" in Mark and another in Matthew and Luke[17]: and we find one word for "needle" in Luke and another in Matthew and Mark.[18] In Matthew and Mark we read that Herod said to others, "This is John the Baptist: he is risen from

[14] Luke 9. 45 to 18. 30.
[15] Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, p. 177.
[16] Mark 4. 38; Matt. 8. 25; Luke 8. 24.
[17] τρυμαλιᾶς, Mark 10. 25; τρήματος Matt. 19. 24; Luke 18. 25.
[18] βελόνης, Luke 18. 25; ῥαφίδος, Matt. 19. 24; Mark 10. 25.

the dead." In Luke we read that others said this to Herod.[19] In the account of the crucifixion Mark says that one ran and filled a sponge full of vinegar and put it on a reed, and gave it to Jesus to drink, saying, "Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down." In Matthew we find the same account, but this speech, "Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him," is put into the mouth of the bystanders.[20] Examples of such differences could be multiplied indefinitely.

5. Sometimes statements are made by one of the synoptists which would lead us to mistaken conclusions if another of the synoptists did not set us right in the matter. For example, if we had only Matthew's account of the birth and infancy of Jesus we would suppose that Joseph and Mary went to Nazareth only after the return from Egypt and in consequence of a divine warning in a dream. However, from Luke we learn that Nazareth was the home city of the parents of Jesus, that they left it and went to Bethlehem only for the census, and that after the presentation in the temple they returned to Nazareth. If we had Luke's account of the resurrection appearances of Jesus and no other, we would have supposed that all of these were in the neighborhood of Jerusalem; but Matthew tells us plainly of an appearance in Galilee as well.

6. The synoptists sometimes contradict each other. In Luke 3. 3 we read that John the Baptist came into all the region round about Jordan. In Matt. 3. 5 the statement is that all the region round about Jordan went out unto John. In Mark 6. 8, 9 Jesus expressly permits the twelve to carry a staff and to go shod with sandals. In Matt. 10. 10 Jesus expressly prohibits these things. It evidently is the same discourse, and it is seemingly impossible for both evangelists to be correct. Jesus either permitted or prohibited these

---

[19] Matt. 14. 2; Mark 6. 16; Luke 9. 7.

[20] Mark 15. 36; Matt. 27. 49.

things. He could not have done both at one and the same time. Mark tells us that Herodias desired to kill John but she could not because Herod feared him. Matthew says that Herod desired to kill John and did not, because he feared the multitude.[21] These statements are not necessarily contradictory, although they are apparently so.

Matthew and Mark both say that the transfiguration took place six days after the events just recorded by them. Luke explicitly says that it took place eight days after these things.[22] Matthew says that Jesus commanded his disciples to pray after the manner which he records in his Sermon on the Mount. Luke records this prayer upon another occasion and not at all after that manner. He omits two of the petitions found in Matthew and changes two of the others. Matthew would have us pray after one manner, Luke would have us pray differently; and as a matter of fact, most of us repeat the prayer in a manner different from that prescribed by either of them.[23]

In Mark Jairus tells Jesus that his daughter is at the point of death. In Matthew Jairus says that she is already dead.[24] In Matt. 8. 5 we read that the centurion came to Jesus himself. In Luke 7. 3 we read that he sent unto Jesus some of the Jews. Matthew seems to put the profaning of the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn and eating them and by curing the man with the withered hand on the same Sabbath. Luke explicitly says that the miracle of the cure was performed on another Sabbath.[25] In Mark Peter's denial follows the trial before the Sanhedrin, while in Luke it precedes it. Mark says that the women came to the tomb when the Sabbath was past. Matthew says that they came late on the Sabbath. Luke says that they came on the first

[21] Mark 6. 19, 20; Matt. 14. 5.
[22] Matt. 17. 1; Mark 9. 2; Luke 9. 28.
[23] Matt. 6. 9-13; Luke 11. 2-4.
[24] Mark 5. 23; Matt. 9. 18.
[25] Matt. 12. 1-14; Luke 6. 1-11.

day of the week, at early dawn.[26] If Mark and Luke are right, Matthew must be wrong.

Mark tells us that as Jesus went out from Jericho, the blind beggar, Bartimæus, was healed. Matthew says that as they went out from Jericho two blind men were healed. Luke says that as Jesus drew nigh unto Jericho a certain blind man was healed, and from his account we conclude that it was the man whom Mark called Bartimæus.[27] Why does Matthew say there were two blind men, while Mark and Luke mention only one? Why do Mark and Matthew locate the healing at the time of leaving Jericho, while Luke puts it at the time of entering the city? They cannot all be right. Some one has blundered. In the narrative of Mark we gather that Peter's second denial was in answer to a challenge made by the same young woman who had first identified him. In Matthew we are explicitly told that it was another young woman who made this second charge. In Luke we are surprised to read that this second accusation was made by a man.[28]

This list of apparent and real contradictions might be increased. However, none of the other cases are of any greater importance than these we have instanced; and all will agree that particulars like these are not essential to the conception of the life and work of Christ. The important fact in the case of Bartimæus, for instance, is the fact of the healing and not the exact spot on which it took place, and the important fact in the case of Peter is his denial and not the person or persons who occasioned it.

We now have seen that the synoptists follow the same general order of narration, repeat each other in much or most of their material, sometimes follow the same strange method of telling their story, sometimes reproduce certain peculiarities of language, and sometimes are not merely

[26] Mark 16. 2; Matt. 28. 1; Luke 24. 1.

[27] Matt. 20. 29-34; Mark 10. 46-52; Luke 18. 35-43.

[28] Mark 14. 69; Matt. 26. 71, ἄλλη; Luke 22. 58, ἕτερος.

parallel but absolutely identical in their expression. On the other hand, we have seen that they do not always follow the same order in their narratives, and each of them adds to the narratives of the others, and each of them omits portions of the narratives of the others, and each of them transposes the narratives of the others, and they give different accounts of the same event or the same saying, and they apparently or really contradict each other at many points. How are we to explain these strange phenomena? That is the problem, and Professor Iverach says of it, "No more complex problem was ever set to literary criticism than that presented by the similarities and differences of the synoptic Gospels." [29]

IV. Responsibilities

1. Let us say, first of all, that Jesus is not directly responsible for the record found in our synoptics or for the form in which that record has been made. He never interested himself in such things. He himself never wrote anything while he was upon the earth, as far as we know, except upon one occasion when he wrote with his finger in the dust upon the temple floor something or other of great moment to those who were looking on; but we can only guess what it was, and we know that that writing was obliterated and lost long ago. Jesus never dictated anything to anyone for later publication, as far as we know, and we do not know that anyone ever thought of taking notes of any of his sayings or doings while he was still with them. We read in one place that his disciples remembered that he had said certain things only after his resurrection from the dead. Evidently, they had no written notes from which to refresh their memories of these things.

We do not gather from our records that Jesus ever took any special pains to impress any particular phraseology

[29] International Standard Bible Encyclopædia, p. 1282.

upon the minds of his followers. Possibly the formulation of the so-called Lord's Prayer might stand as a single example of that sort, and we have seen how in that case we have very different versions handed down to us. Then if Jesus neither dictated anything nor wrote anything nor taught anything with patient repetitions until he was sure that the disciples had it committed with verbal exactness which would insure absolute integrity in its preservation, it would seem that he was not convinced of the necessity of any such thing and was willing that the record of his life and words should be left to the chances of imperfect remembrance and something less than infallible accuracy of preservation. At any rate, his evident negligence to provide any written memorials in his lifetime will clear him of all responsibility for our synoptic Gospels in the exact form in which we have them to-day. They were produced after his death. The responsibility for them must lie in other hands.

2. Let us say, in the second place, that the Holy Spirit is not responsible for the exact form in which our synoptics appear. The doctrine of literal verbal inspiration surely must go to pieces in any candid mind before the parallel columns of Rushbrooke's Synopticon or Wright's Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek or Thompson's The Synoptic Gospels. The minute and meaningless variations in these parallel columns would convict any man of irreverence and irrationality, if he could be proved to be individually responsible for them. The purposelessness and the frivolity of these almost numberless and wholly insignificant changes from one tense to another and from one mood to another and from one number to another and from one case to another would be just as apparent if the responsibility for them were thrown back upon the Holy Spirit. We find one order of words in one synoptist. We find another order of the same words in another synoptist. No possible reason can be assigned for the change in the order.

The meaning is not changed; the emphasis is not changed. It seems to be a purely arbitrary choice on the part of each writer. That is an explanation of the change; but if a single personality were made responsible for both forms, we would at once challenge the sense or the use of it. We have too much reverence for the Holy Spirit to say that he is responsible for these textual, verbal, literal changes.

3. We conclude then, in the third place, that these phenomena both of resemblance and of divergence in the synoptists must rest in the last analysis upon the responsibility and the personality of the individual authors or compilers. In the Royal Art Museum in Berlin there is a picture of Matthew writing his Gospel. He is represented as an old man with a flowing beard, seated at a desk upon which there is a roll. Behind him stands an angel who reaches over his shoulder and guides his pen. There is a look of intense surprise on Matthew's face, as he sees what his own hand, guided by the angel, has written. The picture represents a once common conception of inspiration; the arbitrary, mechanical guidance of a pen rather than the inspiration of a man. God guides no man's pen as the mechanical instrument of his will. He moves some man's heart, and the man, heart-stirred, moves his own pen with active brain and willing hand. God does not send messages through human telephones. His words are not repeated by human phonographs. His messengers are not impassive instruments but active, able, free-will agents, called and responsive to the call.

Holy men of old were moved by the Holy Spirit, not as the primitive chaos was moved by that same Spirit, not arbitrarily but voluntarily. The evolution and the realization of God's designs in them was conditioned by their human intelligence and by their human receptivity. God's inspiration always took on the stamp of the individuality of the human personality which appropriated it. God's messengers who dwelt among men have been men like other

men. His greatest message was sent through his Son as a man. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, and Jesus were not abnormally appropriated to the proclamation of God's will. They were not moved *in spite of themselves* by the Holy Spirit, and they were not moved *out of themselves.* The Holy Spirit moved *them,* and in their own personalities they worked out the designs of God. Human individuality is apparent on every page of our New Testament, and nowhere more so than in the pages of the synoptists. These men differed in mental equipment and literary style, and in personal prejudices and preferences, and in spiritual insight and in sources of information: and these differences appear in their books.

Having concluded that the phenomena which constitute the Synoptic Problem must find their ultimate explanation in the individualities of the authors or compilers of the synoptic Gospels we are far from having disposed of our difficulties. The next question is, How does it happen that these individuals have composed or compiled Gospels in which these strange resemblances and differences exist?

V. Aids

1. *Luke's Preface.* Matthew and Mark have told us nothing at all about the method of their procedure in writing their books. Luke, however, has written a preface to his narrative in which he makes some statements concerning the sources of information upon which he has drawn in its composition. He was not an eyewitness of the events in the Gospel history. He does not say that any special revelation had been given him concerning these things. He does not write at the direction of any heavenly voice or at the dictation of any supernatural visitant. He does not assert that he had any direct or peculiar inspiration of the Holy Spirit. If Luke had been able to claim any extraordinary and all-sufficing authority of that sort he surely would have mentioned it. He is anxious to authenticate his narrative and

to establish its trustworthiness, and he gives to Theophilus the best reasons he has for believing that he has written the certain truth. What does he say?

He says that he writes of his own accord, and the only credential he presents is that of painstaking investigation of all the sources of information at his command. He certifies, however, that the result of this investigation is in his judgment a fuller, more accurate, and more orderly account of the life of Jesus than any of which he knew. He divides the chief sources of the facts he has written into documentary material and oral testimony. There had been many attempts at narrative of which in their manuscript form he was able to avail himself and upon which he felt he had been able to improve. There were also many eye-witnesses still living whom he was able to interview and who delivered to him their first-hand information concerning many things. Upon the basis of his documents and the careful recording of apostolic tradition as given to himself Luke assures Theophilus that he may rely upon the certainty of the things he here finds recorded.[30] This is all of the gratuitous information furnished us in the synoptic Gospels concerning their composition. If we learn anything more, it must be by the study of their internal characteristics and peculiarities.

2. *Minute Research.* An immense amount of work has been done in this field. As a single example we might cite the Seminar formed in the University of Oxford for the study of the Synoptic Problem. It met nine times a year for sixteen years. Then the results of the patient and united efforts of these scholars were published in the volume entitled Studies in the Synoptic Problem. Other volumes, like Sir J. C. Hawkins's Horæ Synopticæ, are marvels of minute research and represent a lifetime of labor. It would seem safe to say that every possible scrap of evidence has

[30] Luke 1. 1-4.

been accumulated through the successive generations of ungrudging drudgery at the task.

Possibly the minute pedantry of the ancient rabbis has been more nearly reproduced in the study of the Synoptic Problem than in any other part of our Scriptures. Those ancient scribes and masters of the law knew how many verses and how many words and how many letters there were in every book of their Bible. They knew how many times certain words occurred at the beginning of a verse and how many times at the end of a verse. They knew all the petty phenomena as well as the weightier matters in the law. The same thing has come to be true of the three synoptic Gospels. They have been subjected to microscopic investigation. Every last detail has been considered in its bearing upon the solution of their relationship.

We sometimes have thought that the erudition displayed in the study of the Synoptic Problem is like that of the Scholastics of the Dark Ages. Milman says of these, "Latin Christianity raised up those vast monuments of theology which amaze and appall the mind with the enormous accumulation of intellectual industry, ingenuity, and toil: but of which the sole result to posterity is this barren amazement." An amazing amount of scholarship has been expended upon the Synoptic Problem in the last two centuries, and he would be a very hopeful man who would think that the final word on the question was within sight or hearing to-day. Eminently learned and ingenious men have had their say about it. They have been eminently critical too. Their investigations have rivaled those of the Schoolmen in their painstaking minuteness. They have been thorough in their research. They have accumulated and assorted vast quantities of facts. Many of them have been very assured in the announcement of their results. They have held opposing and mutually destructive theories, and they have fought, bled, and died in their behalf. Each generation has quietly buried the combatants of the preced-

ing generation and in many cases their theories have been quietly laid to rest with them. Probably some of these theories are dead beyond all hope of resurrection.

We think that some things are pretty generally agreed upon in our day. Yet there are very strenuous advocates of rival hypotheses still in the field. No man who volunteers to settle the whole question for us can command the universal suffrage of scholars. Frequently he represents no one but himself. Any new discovery of manuscripts may revolutionize the whole aspect of things at any time. Under such circumstances no one can prophesy with any degree of assurance what the verdict of the next generation or the next century will be.

VI. Theories

At present the Problem of the synoptic Gospels has resolved itself into the problem of the sources from which the synoptists drew the material for their Gospels. Gloag says, "It is the most difficult problem in the criticism of the New Testament."[31] The two main sources are those suggested in the preface to the Gospel according to Luke, oral testimony and written documents: and the two most active differing schools of thought on the subject to-day are, first, the one which pins its faith largely, if not wholly, upon the oral tradition as accounting for the resemblances and the differences in the synoptic Gospels, and, second, the one which pins its faith largely, if not wholly, upon a single original document or a series of such as an adequate explanation for all the puzzling features which the synoptics present.

1. *Oral Tradition.* Gieseler, Westcott, and Wright have been the protagonists for the Oral Tradition Theory. It is not always easy to assign the critics to one school rather than another, since each is apt to hold an attitude more or less mediating or more or less independent, but possibly Credner, Neudecker, Norton, Lachmann, Lange, Lumby,

[31] Gloag, Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, p. 43.

Plumptre, Ebrard, Thiersch, Abbott, Alford, Renan, Farrar, Schaff, Thomson, Row, Wendt, Guericke, Godet, Gould, and Weiss might be classed together here.

(1) Authoritative Teaching. These critics do not rule out the use of all documents, of course: but they maintain that before any documents came into existence the general form of the gospel narrative had become fixed in a cycle of authoritative oral teaching. The apostles were the chief authorities for the facts of the life of Jesus at first. They did not immediately set about the writing of books. They did begin their preaching at once, and in the beginning they confined themselves largely to the telling of the historical facts in the life of the Redeemer. As they went from place to place by dint of repetition the order of the narrative tended to become fixed, and even the form in which particular incidents were repeated would gradually establish itself in the minds and on the tongues of both the hearers and the speakers. At the same time slightly different forms of reminiscence might go back to different apostles for their original authority.

(2) Oriental Memory. In addition to this unquestioned fact that the preaching of the gospel must have preceded the writing of any Gospels, we are asked to remember that the Oriental memory was trained to a much higher degree than we are apt to conceive possible here in the West. It was the habit in the schools of the rabbis for the disciples to retain all of the teaching imparted to them without the aid of textbooks or notes. They were expected to attend closely, to remember fully, and to repeat accurately. The traditions were handed down from generation to generation in that way. It has also been suggested that there were catechetical schools among the Christians from the very first, and that systematic instruction was imparted to all converts in such schools. It is stated in Luke's preface that Theophilus had been instructed in this catechetical fashion.[32]

[32] Luke 1. 4, κατηχήθης.

Paul wrote to the Galatians, "Let the catechumen in respect to the word share with the one catechizing in all good things."[33] He wrote to Timothy to give double honor to those elders who toiled hard in the word and in teaching.[34] It was their duty to din the truth into the ears of their pupils. It was mechanical and disagreeable work; but their incessant reiteration insured the perfect transmission of the tradition. There may have been an element of Rabbinical pedantry in it, but the gospel truths and facts were fixed in form and in memory in this fashion. If there were several such schools and a slightly different tradition were preserved and reproduced in each, that would go far to help toward the explanation of the Synoptic phenomena.

(3) Fragments of Writing. Remembering that the preaching of the apostles was largely historical in the beginning and that they were the chief authorities for the account of the words and the works of the Lord, and remembering the Oriental retentiveness of memory which would tend to fix the form not only of the story as told but as repeated by others, we have the basis for a belief that a particular selection of incidents and sayings and a particular form for their presentation would establish itself in Christian circles before any one would attempt to put any of these things into writing. Such attempts surely would be made in time. In all probability some of the briefer sayings would be written first, then some collection of these sayings would be made, then some account of the miracles would be committed to writing, then the longer discourses, then the eschatological prophecies. These fragments would then be united by some hand or by several hands into the first attempts at a continuous sketch of the life of Jesus. The best of these would be used by our evangelists.

The parallels in the Synoptics would thus be explained by the more or less fluid while yet more or less fixed form

[33] Gal. 6. 6, ὁ κατηχούμενος . . . τῷ κατηχοῦντι.

[34] 1. Tim. 5. 17.

of the primitive oral tradition, and the minute or more important variations would be explained by the fact that the most credible witnesses will differ more or less in giving the account of the same matters, and the best-trained memories will be imperfect at some points, while at the same time, having made due allowance for the differences in the oral or written sources of information open to each evangelist, we must still leave room for his personal preferences and tastes in the selection and the shaping of his material. It was the patent superiority of our Synoptic Gospels to all of their predecessors which insured their preservation and supremacy in the church while their models, or forerunners, perished.

Stated generally, this seems like a very satisfactory theory of the composition of the Synoptic Gospels. It is only when we come to the application of it in detail that doubts arise in the minds of many scholars as to whether we can rely upon it as an adequate hypothesis. If it is to be trusted at all, why does it not go farther? If retentive memories account for much, why do they not account for more? If oral tradition be supposed to fix some things, why did it not fix others? Stanton concludes, "The relations between the first three Gospels cannot be adequately explained simply by the influence of oral tradition," [35] and Moffatt affirms, "The Gospels are books made out of books; none of them is a document which simply transcribes the oral teaching of an apostle or of apostles. Their agreements and differences cannot be explained except on the hypothesis of a more or less close literary relationship, and while oral tradition is a *vera causa,* it is only a subordinate factor in the evolution of our canonical Greek gospels." [36] The present generation of critics seems to be swinging away from any rigid adherence to the oral-tradition theory and to be concluding that

[35] Stanton, The Gospels as Historical Documents, ii, 17.

[36] Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 180.

the more hopeful line of research will be that of the reconstruction of original documents. Harnack is at present leading the way in this direction.

2. *Documentary Sources.* Lessing and Eichhorn made the first investigation into the *Urkunden,* or original documents lying back of our Synoptic Gospels. Eichhorn began by positing a single *Urevangelium,* or primitive Gospel, written in Aramaic about the time of the stoning of Stephen; but having embarked upon the high seas of adventure along this line he kept discovering new sources until the very profusion and wantonness and arbitrariness of his inventions discredited the whole performance. He made a great sensation in his day, even more than Harnack has made in our day; but no one gives much heed to his conjectures now. Schleiermacher suggested the Logia, a collection of the sayings of Jesus, and a series of more or less extensive compilations of narratives, leading up to a proto-Mark and then to our Synoptics. Weisse was content to presuppose the Logia with our canonical Mark as the basis of the other two Synoptics. All of the Tübingen school were disposed to believe in a primitive Aramaic source of our Gospels, and they usually declared that our Matthew was a combination of a more liberal document with this source, and Luke was a Pauline protest supplemented from Ebionite sources, and Mark compiled his narrative from both of these. The general positions of the Tübingen school have been relegated to the theological scrap-heap by this time, and their contributions to the discussion of the Synoptic problem carry as little weight as anything they said.

We will put down in a single paragraph some sample conclusions of some modern authorities as to the sources of the Synoptic Gospels and the order of their composition. Holtzmann believes that there was 1. A proto-Mark, the original form of Mark's Gospel. 2. The Logia, a collection of the sayings of Jesus. 3. Our canonical Mark. 4. Matthew. 5. Luke. He thinks that the last two were founded

upon the first and second, and used additional materials. Weiss posits the order as follows, 1. The Logia. 2. An original Gospel according to Matthew, made up of the Logia and added incidents. 3. Mark, a recollection of Peter's preaching and as much of Matthew's discourses as would harmonize with his plans. 4. Our canonical Matthew, founded on Mark and the Logia. 5. Luke, founded on Mark, the Logia, and other sources. Zahn posits 1. Matthew in Hebrew. 2. Mark. 3. Luke. 4. Matthew in Greek. Jülicher thinks that the earliest sources were our Mark and the Logia of Matthew, and that our Matthew and Luke use these two and also other sources.

Harnack has carried his researches into the history of the early church back into the time of the composition of the Gospels, and he has chosen to use the term Quelle or its abbreviation Q instead of the old term Logia: and he thinks that Mark and Q are the two, and the only two, common sources for Matthew and Luke. He has undertaken to reconstruct Q with genuine German thoroughness and the usual German subjective arbitrariness. James Hope Moulton and Benjamin Wisner Bacon and Willoughby C. Allen have shown good reasons why we should hesitate to accept without question his conclusions along this line. Wellhausen and Weiss have offered pertinent objections to Harnack's generalizations, and have gone into still more minute and even microscopic investigation of supposable sources. The dominant interest at present seems to lie in work along these lines. In our judgment the farther it is carried the less confidence it will command in both the expert and the lay mind.

VII. Conclusions

What may we conclude on the basis of the facts now presented? 1. The Synoptic Problem is not much nearer a solution to-day than it has been at any previous time in the history of the church. We have more facts in hand than

scholarship has been able to accumulate before this generation; but these facts only serve to increase the intricacies of the problem and they do not seem to insure any greater unanimity of conclusion on the part of the scholarly world. Without some added discoveries of documents in Egypt or elsewhere, a rather remote possibility, there is little or no reason to think that any sufficient solution of the Synoptic Problem is possible. In details the history of the composition of our Synoptic Gospels will remain a mystery for all time to come.

The facts which would be adequate to our need at this point are lost in the dim mazes of antiquity and in all probability they are lost forever. Zahn is well within the truth when he says, "Up to the present time no one of the investigations of the Synoptic Problem can be said to have produced results which have been generally accepted, or that can lay well-grounded claims to such acceptance. In one point only is there agreement, namely, that it is impossible to set forth the history of the origin of the first three Gospels in a satisfactory manner on the basis of reliable reports and trustworthy observations; that, rather, gaps remain in our knowledge based upon these two classes of data, which must be filled up by conjecture." [37]

However, there are some general conclusions upon which a majority of the critics may now be said to agree. Henry Latimer Jackson in his survey of criticism in this field sums up his discussion rather hopefully. He says, "The present state of the Synoptic Problem has been described as chaotic. To a certain extent the description must be allowed; where points of controversy are many and conflict of opinion is sharply illustrated, it might indeed seem that the utmost confusion reigns in what is spoken of as the fundamental problem of New Testament criticism, and consequently of Christian origins. There is nevertheless some warrant for

[37] Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii, p. 418.

stating the position in more hopeful terms; if inexact knowledge of the situation finds much to suggest utter chaos, experts will allow that in spite of goings after side issues, modern scientific research has been steadily approximating to an agreement in regard to main points. It is after all possible to report progress.[38] . . . The probability is that absolute certainty on every point will never be attained. But there are signs of an advance; the goal is in clearer view." [39]

2. The oral hypothesis has much truth in it. Oral narratives came first in order, and they would have a tendency to take a fixed form. However, this hypothesis alone never can give more than general help in the consideration of the problem. It fails in adequacy whenever we try to apply it to the minute details of variations in the Synoptics. In the Encyclopædia Biblica Schmiedel brands it as an *asylum ignorantiæ* and an *asylum orthodoxiæ,* and his feeling is shared by most students of the subject to-day. The facts must be faced, and the facts point to written sources as well as an oral tradition.

3. If we feel ourselves forced to assume that written documents lie behind our canonical Gospels, and either that any of them borrowed from others or that they borrowed from any common sources, we still must face the facts. They seem to compel us to the conclusion that our Synoptists felt free to add to or omit from or transpose or otherwise change their sources as they thought best. If this seem to any one to be irreverent or impossible we simply appeal to the facts. The phenomena point to written sources. Yet the Synoptists give us different genealogies of Jesus, different forms for the so-called Lord's Prayer, different accounts of the institution of the Lord's supper, different forms of the inscription on the cross, and different reports of the same discourses. How far these differences are due to dif-

[38] Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 454.

[39] *Op. cit.,* p. 456.

ferent documents or to individual preferences in dealing with the same document who will be able to decide for us?

4. The Gospel according to Mark probably is the oldest of the Synoptists. Allen calls this "the one solid result of literary criticism." Both Matthew and Luke may have made use of Mark in the composition of their Gospels. Alford, Plumptre, Schaff, and Westcott are convinced that neither Matthew nor Luke has done this. These are good authorities, but present criticism has declared against them at this point. Patton says that "the one universally accepted result of modern study of the synoptic problem is the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon the Gospel of Mark."[40] If we grant this, let us suppose for a moment that our canonical Mark had not been preserved to our time and that nevertheless ninety-three per cent of its contents had been incorporated with our canonical Matthew and Luke and that modern critics had decided that Matthew and Luke must have had a common source from which they had drawn this common material and some of the more adventurous among them had undertaken to reconstruct Mark out of Matthew and Luke, what degree of success could we expect to attend their efforts? They might attain to some general approximation to the appearance of our canonical Mark, but in multitudes of details their conjectures would differ with each other: and that any one of them would reproduce our Mark as it really is, with perfect exactness of chronology and phraseology, would be beyond the wildest reaches of possibility. Yet Harnack and others have attempted a somewhat similar task in the reconstruction of Q; and whatever conclusions they may publish to the world will be interesting and instructive and unsatisfactory. Q in its entirety will no more be attainable by any critic among us than Mark would have been under the suppositions we have suggested.

Archdeacon Allen puts the patent truth of the case very

[40] Patton, Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 3.

pertinently when he says, "Consider what would happen upon this method of putting into the reconstruction of Mark all that was common to the other Synoptic Gospels. In the first place, the critics' Mark would be much larger than the real Mark. It would contain a large part, *e. g.,* of the Sermon on the Mount. Secondly, it would not contain much that is in our Mark. The whole of Mark 6. 45 to 8. 26, *e. g.,* would not be found in it. Thirdly, almost all the characteristics of the real Mark would be absent from it. The vivid and picturesque details, the emphasis upon the thronging crowd, the remarkable use of tenses, the rare words, the emphasis upon the human affections and gestures of the Lord, and upon the strife and ignorance of the Apostles—all these would not be entirely absent, but would be a negligible element in the Mark of the critics. . . . I am sometimes inclined to think that the Q of the critics is due to the feeling that we must have some result of much investigation even though it be obtained by precarious methods. For there is much to make it probable that any attempt to recover a lost source used in the first and third Gospels is a profitless quest." [41]

5. There may have been an original collection of the Sayings of Jesus, the so-called Logia, and it may have been extant both in an Aramaic form and in a Greek translation. Then if one or both of these versions were used by our Synoptists the two versions would help to account for some of the verbal identities and some of the variations of translation. The exact form and extent and content of this original Quelle or Source will be open to conjecture and never can be assured with our present sources of information.

6. There may have been and there probably were many fragments of material used by our Synoptists, the exact number and nature of which no man can determine for us now.

[41] The Interpreter, vol. x, pp. 376, 377.

7. Mark may have known and used the Logia or Q.

8. Matthew probably did not know or use the Gospel written by Luke, and Luke probably did not know or use our canonical Matthew.

9. In our Synoptic Gospels we have no literally inerrant or infallible record either of the teachings or the doings of Jesus. They do give us a substantially accurate and sufficient account of these things. Their purpose was practical rather than pedantic. It was religious rather than rigidly historical. They did not carefully copy texts. They were not particular about minute details. They intended to give, and they did give, a faithful and serviceable picture of the man Jesus, his words and his works. In all the great essentials of the narrative they agree. The personality they set forth is the same and is unmistakable in each of their books. They were not punctilious about little matters of time and place. They possibly had no ideal in their thought of verbal accuracy. They did have the Ideal Personality in mind and they sought to interpret that personality to their generation with all the aids they could summon, and their success was such that it drove all competitors from the field and it has satisfied the religious needs of the world from their day to our own.

We have a fourth Gospel, and we are thankful that it is so different from the Synoptists that it may be considered a wholly independent attempt at the portraiture of the Personality of Jesus, and it suggests how inexhaustible that personality was and what different impressions it must have made on different men. We are thankful for all the differences there are in the Synoptists, as bearing testimony to this same multiform impressiveness. We are thankful to believe that the substantial historicity of the Synoptic narratives has been established by all recent research and that it has approved itself through all the Christian centuries.

PART V

THE BOOK OF ACTS

PART V

THE BOOK OF ACTS

I. Name of the Book

1. *The Acts of Peter and Paul.* The fifth book of the New Testament is entitled *The Acts of the Apostles* in the Vaticanus and most of the uncial manuscripts, and the book is cited by this name in Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, the Muratorian Fragment, and many ancient authorities; but in quotations by Origen, the most learned of the church Fathers, and in the superscription of the Sinaiticus, we find the abridged title, *The Acts.* This is a better title, for Luke's second volume does not appear upon examination to be a history of the twelve apostles. They are mentioned and enumerated in the first chapter,[1] but the after history wholly ignores most of them, and only meager mention is made of any of them, except Peter, James, and John.

We have the account of James's martyrdom,[2] and John is mentioned on two occasions as the companion of Peter,[3] but he still occupies the silent and subordinate position which the Gospels had given him. More prominence in the narrative is given to Stephen the martyr and Philip the evangelist, both of them deacons in the Jerusalem church, and to Barnabas and Silas and Paul, all of them missionaries beyond the borders of Palestine, than to any member of the apostolic company, except Peter, the organizer, originator, spokesman, and head. Peter is the hero of

[1] Acts 1. 13, 26.
[2] Acts 12. 2.
[3] Acts 3. 1-12; 8. 14.

the former half of the history, as Paul is the hero of the latter half, and the book might be named with more accuracy *The Acts of Peter and Paul.* From this point of view there are two clearly distinguishable sections of the book. The Doings of Peter are recorded in the first twelve chapters, and The Missions and Sufferings of Paul are narrated in the remaining chapters of the history. The whole history of the church is shown to revolve about these two men. As in the Apocalypse John had the vision of the two prophets and witnesses who were the two olive trees and the two candlesticks, standing before the Lord of the earth,[4] so in the Book of the Acts of Peter and Paul we are shown how the Christian Church was founded by these two apostles who furnished the inspiration and the illumination of leadership necessary to make it a power among men. These were the two anointed ones chosen in the beginning to stand for the Lord before the whole earth.[5]

2. *The Acts of the Ascended Lord.* This is the second volume of Luke's Church History. In the first volume, The Gospel according to Luke, he tells us that he had narrated "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach." [6] In this second volume he narrates all that Jesus continues both to do and to teach. The ascended Christ is not separated either in sympathy or presence from his church. He is at hand in all the crises of its history. He is active continuously in the midst of it. From the Father's presence he sends forth the Pentecostal baptism which is the church's needed enduement of power.[7] When the lame man was walking and leaping and praising God there at the Beautiful Gate of the temple, Peter declared to the multitude that this first miracle after Pentecost was wrought in the name and by the power of the still living and ascended Lord.[8] Stephen saw him standing at the Father's right hand, ready

[4] Rev. 11. 3, 4.
[5] Zech. 4. 14.
[6] Acts 1. 1.
[7] Acts 2. 32, 33.
[8] Acts 3. 16.

to welcome the first martyr home.[9] On the road to Damascus he appeared to Saul and in personal conversation he called the "chosen vessel" to his unique career.[10] He talked with Peter on the housetop at Joppa and prepared him for the reception of the first Gentile convert into the no longer exclusively Jewish but now universal church.[11]

It was the Lord from heaven who opened Lydia's heart to give heed to the things which were spoken by Paul.[12] When troubles were multiplied in Corinth and there was so much to discourage and alarm, the Lord spoke to Paul in a night vision and said to him, "Be not afraid . . . ; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to harm thee."[13] The ascended Lord always is present with his own, and he gives them divine guidance and blessing in every time of special need.[14] It was he who sent Paul and his helpers westward into the newer continent and along the zone of power. All their spiritual life and strength were derived from their living Lord. All the miracle-working power these early Christians possessed was from him, graciously given or at times sovereignly withheld.[15] He was the center and soul of all their teaching and preaching, the omnipotent Source of all their success in evangelism.[16] The unseen presence and power of the ascended Lord was the secret, the all-sufficient explanation, of the church's marvelous growth from Jerusalem to the uttermost parts of the earth. The deeds of the Lord recorded in the Gospels were only a beginning of his work in and for his church. Luke's second volume gives the continuation of these deeds,

---

[9] Acts 7. 55, 56.
[10] Acts 9. 3-6.
[11] Acts 10. 13-16.
[12] Acts 16. 14.
[13] Acts 18. 9.
[14] Acts 16. 6, 7, 10.
[15] Acts 3. 6, 16; 9. 34.
[16] Acts 2. 32-36; 5. 42; 8. 5; 10. 36-43; 16. 31; 26. 22, 23.

and it might be named *The Acts of the Glorified Jesus,* or *The Acts of the Ascended Lord.*

It was Christmas Evans who said, "Most reformations die with their reformers; but this Reformer ever lives to carry on his reformation." That is one chief lesson of the book of Acts. Those first apostles and evangelists were worshiping no dead Jew. They worshiped and preached a living Lord. They believed that he was active in the midst of his people still. The stress of their gospel proclamation always fell upon the resurrection. It was their faith in the resurrected and ascended Lord which gave them hope and insured them victory. If their leader had been dead, their cause would have been lost. He was alive, and he was with them for evermore.

3. *The Acts of the Holy Spirit.* No writer in the New Testament emphasizes the personality of the Holy Spirit as Luke does. In the Gospels, when Matthew says, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give *good things* to them who ask him," [17] Luke prefers to summarize all other good gifts in the greatest gift of God to man, and he says, "Your heavenly Father" will "give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him." [18] The Holy Spirit is the best of all "good things" in Luke's estimation; and his second volume is a prolonged proof of the justification of this standpoint. We never would have known about the baptism at Pentecost, if Luke had not written this history; for no other book in the New Testament makes mention of it. That baptism with the Spirit marked the beginning of the new dispensation, a dispensation which has had no end as yet. The history of the Christian Church began there at Pentecost, for the Christian Church is the church filled with the Spirit of God. Peter preached to those who were under conviction that day that remission of sins and the

[17] Matt. 7. 11.

[18] Luke 11. 13.

reception of the gift of the Holy Spirit were the two things necessary to admission into the Christian fellowship, which was to be a holy fellowship in the common possession of the Spirit of God.[19]

This mighty personality, the Holy Spirit, made so prominent in the beginning of the book, continues to be the efficient and sufficient Comforter, Illuminator, and Enduer with power to the very close. The church claimed that he presided in their councils and their conclusions were published in his name. They said, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us." [20] It was the Holy Spirit who said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them," [21] and they went out to their missionary career, "being sent forth by the Holy Spirit." [22] Paul said to the elders of Ephesus, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops." [23] It was by the authority of the Holy Spirit that the affairs of the church were administered. It was he who chose their ministers and guided them into the truth.

Stephen was a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, and the disputers could not withstand the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake.[24] The Lord sent Ananias to Saul that he might receive his sight and that he might be filled with the Holy Spirit.[25] Barnabas was a good man, full of the Holy Spirit and of faith, and that made him a most successful evangelist.[26] The Holy Spirit fell upon the twelve at Ephesus and they spake with tongues and prophesied even as the one hundred and twenty had at Pentecost.[27] We read that the church throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria had peace, and, walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, it was

---

[19] Acts 2. 38.
[20] Acts 15. 28.
[21] Acts 13. 2.
[22] Acts 13. 4.
[23] Acts 20. 28.
[24] Acts 6. 5, 10.
[25] Acts 9. 17.
[26] Acts 11. 24.
[27] Acts 19. 6.

multiplied.[28] Peter told Cornelius how God had anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power,[29] and this book makes it clear that all the disciples of Jesus were expected to be like their Master at this point. They were to be men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom.[30]

Each of the three great forward movements in the history of the church in this book is marked by a notable outpouring of the Holy Spirit. At Pentecost they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.[31] In Samaria Peter and John laid their hands upon the converts and they received the Holy Spirit.[32] At Cæsarea Peter preached to Cornelius and his household, and the Holy Spirit fell on all them that heard the word.[33] The disciples had been commanded to preach to Jews and Samaritans and Gentiles, and as they obeyed the command the Holy Spirit gave them the sanction of his outpouring of power. No book in the Bible mentions the Holy Spirit as often as this book. There are fifty-seven direct references to his manifest presence; and if we include allusions, he is mentioned some seventy-one times. The book could well be named *The Acts of the Holy Spirit.*

4. *The Acts of the Missionary Church.* This book has been the missionary manual of the Christian centuries. Its motto is found in the eighth verse of the first chapter, "Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The narrative enlarges upon this theme. In chapters 1 to 8 the church is established in Jerusalem. In chapters 8 and 9 the gospel is preached in Judæa and Samaria. In chapters 10 to 28 the message is carried to the ends of the earth. The founding of the local church, home missions and foreign missions follow in rapid and legitimate

[28] Acts 9. 31.
[29] Acts 10. 38.
[30] Acts 6. 3.
[31] Acts 2. 4.
[32] Acts 8. 17.
[33] Acts 10. 44.

succession. The three successive centers of this activity, marking the beginning, middle, and consummation of it, are Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome.

It is interesting to note that the order of the synoptic Gospels in our Bibles and the course of events in this book parallel each other. First, we have the Gospel according to Matthew, which is the Gospel for the Jews; and then the Gospel according to Mark, which is the Gospel for the Romans; and then the Gospel according to Luke, which is the Gospel for the Greeks. So in the book of Acts we find that the gospel is preached first in Jerusalem and Judæa to the Jews, and then at Cæsarea to Cornelius the Roman centurion, and then through Asia Minor and Macedonia and Achaia to the Greeks. We learn how Jews and Romans and Greeks were won to the faith, and the success of the early evangelists has been a stimulus to the church ever since. The book of Acts has furnished more inspiration to missionary effort at home and abroad than any other volume in the literature of the faith. It has shown what can be accomplished and also the best methods of accomplishment. Zöckler has well said, "We have to thank the book of Acts that the missionary methods and results of these disciples, especially of Peter and Paul, are known to us more fully and exactly than the history of all the next-following heroes of the Christian missionary movement till we come to Columba and Gallus, Wilfrid and Willibrod."[34] The book which gives us this information and this inspiration might be called *The Acts of the Missionary Church.* The first half of the book has to do with the church at Jerusalem, the church of the twelve apostles, the church of the circumcision. The second half of the book has to do with the church of the empire, the church of the uncircumcision. Both were missionary churches. The active and aggressive church always is a missionary church.

5. *The Acts of the Methodist Church.* Luke introduces

[34] Strack-Zöckler Kommentar, S. 146.

a very peculiar term for the Christian faith in this narrative. He calls it ἡ ὁδός, The Way.[35] That name had the suggestion of ceaseless motion in it. The Christianity of the beginning history of the church never was at rest. It was on the road, on The Way to wider influence and to better things. On foot, on horseback, on camel-back, on shipboard, it always was on the go. It was persistently itinerant, always pressing forward to some farther goal. Then the Christians had a Way of doing things which was an entirely new way to the world of that day. It was a new Way of thought, a new Way of speech, a new Way of life. The Christians were called "those who belong to The Way." Christianity did not seem to the unbelievers to be a creed, a philosophy, a society, a nationality, so much as it was a Way of thinking, speaking, acting. A Christian was known by the Way he had of looking at life, its duties and responsibilities. His methods won the right of way through the heathen world. This new power in the world, a Methodist Church, won adherents everywhere. The book which records its triumphs might be named *The Acts of the Methodist Church.*

It is well known that the name "Methodist" was first a nickname, applied in derision to the members of the Holy Club there at Oxford "because they observed a more regular method of study and behavior than was usual with those of their age and station." John Wesley did not appreciate the name very highly in the beginning. He wished that it "might never be mentioned more, but be buried in eternal oblivion." Contrary to his desire, the name survived and became the general and popular designation for the members of his societies; and in 1752 John Wesley published a dictionary in which this definition appeared, "A Methodist is one who lives according to the method laid down in the Bible." That was true of the early Christians. They lived according to the method laid down in the Bible of their

[35] Acts 9. 2; 18. 25; 19. 9, 23; 22. 4; 24. 14, 22.

day, and according to the commandment of the Lord and his apostles. This way or method came to characterize them, and they were called the "methodists," "those who belong to the method or way." Their acts then are the acts of the Methodist Church. The name would seem to be applied to them just as properly as it ever was to the followers of John Wesley. In his Journal for January 5, 1761, John Wesley wrote, "We aver that Methodism is the one old religion; as old as the Reformation, as old as Christianity, as old as Moses, as old as Adam." He at least would have claimed kinship with those who were "of the Way" in the book of Acts.

II. Importance of the Book

1. *As a Church History.* This book is invaluable because it gives us our only trustworthy account of the origin of Christianity as an organized world-force. Philip Schaff has said: "Examine and compare the secular historians from Herodotus to Macaulay, and the church historians from Eusebius to Neander, and Luke need not fear a comparison. No history of thirty years has ever been written so truthful and impartial, so important and interesting, so healthy in tone and hopeful in spirit, so aggressive and yet so genial, so cheering and inspiring, so replete with lessons of wisdom and encouragement for work in spreading the gospel of truth and peace, and yet withal so simple and modest, as the Acts of the Apostles. It is the best as well as the first manual of church history."[36] No other book ever could take its place. If the curtain had been drawn upon the crucifixion of Jesus and lifted again only after the death of Paul, we never could have understood how the Christian faith had burst its Jewish bonds and taken its flight over all the Mediterranean lands and established itself as the inevitable conqueror of all the modern world. Nothing

[36] Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. i, p. 739.

seemed more unlikely at the close of the Gospel history. Even as we look back upon the accomplished reality it seems little short of miraculous in our eyes. In the book of Acts Luke has given us the secret of this mystery in a plain and clear narration of the simple and marvelous history.

Dean Farrar suggests that "the preciousness of a book may sometimes best be estimated if we consider the loss which we should experience if we did not possess it. If so, we can hardly value too highly the Acts of the Apostles. Had it not come down to us, there would have been a blank in our knowledge which scarcely anything could have filled up. The origin of Christianity would have been an insoluble enigma. We should have possessed no materials out of which it could be constructed, except, on the one hand, a few scattered remnants of ecclesiastical tradition, and on the other hand shameless misrepresentations, like the pseudo-Clementine forgeries."[37] Therefore, he concludes, "We have in the Acts a picture of the origins of Christianity drawn by one who was himself a leading actor in the early evangelization of the world. Quiet, retiring, unobtrusive, the beloved physician has yet so used for us his sacred gifts of calm observation, of clear expression, of large-hearted catholicity, of intelligent research, that he has won for himself a conspicuous place among the benefactors of mankind."[38]

As the first church history and as the only history of the early church which can make any claim to be authentic, this book is invaluable to the student of church organization and discipline. It is the book of Genesis in the New Testament church. In it we have the beginnings of things. It gives us the account of the first apostolic sermon and of the first apostolic miracle. We find in it the beginnings of ecclesiastical organization. We read here of the first persecution and the first martyr and the first Gentile convert.

[37] Farrar, Messages of the Books, p. 121.
[38] *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

We have the narrative of the proceedings at the first synod. Then we follow with breathless interest the thrilling adventures of the first missionary journeys, and we come upon the founding of the first European church. The Book of Beginnings in the Old Testament told us about the beginnings of the world and of the race and of sin in the race. It recorded the first promise of redemption and the beginning of the chosen race. Luke writes "the beginning of the end." He tells us of the fulfillment of the promise of redemption in the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension of the Lord. Then he records the beginnings of the Christian Church and of the final dispensation of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration and the education of men.

2. *As a Help to Faith.* This book is invaluable again in showing what a Christ-honoring and a Spirit-filled church can accomplish in the face of fearful odds. It has been said that there are five great powers which always have moved and governed human society—eloquence, learning, wealth, rank, arms. In the beginning the church had none of these. On the contrary, all of these were arrayed against it. The eloquence of the orators and the learning of the schools and the wealth of the world and the higher ranks of society and the armies of all the nations were its foes. The missionary evangelists of this book never base their hope of success upon their eloquence or their learning or their wealth or their nobility of birth, and the only weapon they have is the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, the Gospel of Christ. Yet with this they go forth to an immediate conquest of the nations for their Lord. In chapters ten and eleven Peter opens the way into the Gentile world, and then, with the swing of assured and continuous victory, the Church moves out from Jerusalem into all Judæa, and into Samaria, and on into Asia Minor and Europe, and on to the ends of the earth. We read that the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.[39] That name had in it

[39] Acts 11. 26.

the suggestion of a cosmopolitan destination. It embodied a Hebrew conception in a Greek word with a Latin termination. The book of Acts begins with the Hebrew church, and records its planting in the Greek world, and terminates in the Latin capital, Rome. It shows how the Christian Church was true to its name and became the church of all the lands.

Notice the progress of the Kingdom in this book, with three thousand at Pentecost and five thousand a little later, followed by propagandism in Samaria and Damascus and Antioch, and then by the systematic evangelization of all the regions beyond. In an incredibly short time the church is established in Lystra and Iconium and Ephesus and Philippi and Thessalonica and Corinth and Rome. It was no easy task which the church undertook. Those first evangelists had to turn the world upside down, and that is not an easy thing to do while you are living in it and on it. They had to face the prejudices and the bigotries of the centuries. They had to overthrow the barbarisms and the superstitions of the nations. Their message brought them into direct conflict with the idolatries of all the lands and with the licentiousness rampant in all the Orient. It was no easy thing to win the victory against such foes.

Often too there were as many discouragements within as without. There were excitement and excess among new converts. There were fanaticism and folly inside the fold. There were dissensions and divisions and defections. There were misconceptions and misrepresentations. There were false doctrines and false teachers. Some made mistakes and some fell into sin. Yet everywhere the gospel made its way and proved itself the power of God unto salvation to those who believed, whether it was the cripple begging for alms or the proconsul astonished at the teaching of the Lord, the Jews who had crucified the Christ, the Samaritans who had been amazed at the sorceries of Simon, the barbarians of the highlands of Asia, the philosophers of the Areopagus

court, the soldiers and centurions of the Roman legions, the servants of Cæsar's household, the slaves everywhere, jailers, merchants, high officials, Jewish priests, women of high and low degree; all were caught in the rising tide of evangelism and swept as by an irresistible current into the kingdom and church of the resurrected Lord. Philip, Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Luke, and Paul—here is a list of world-conquerors to match with Cyrus, Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon. They conquer without armies and bloodshed, by the presence of the Spirit and the power of the truth. This book is invaluable because it gives the history of their movements and methods and shows us the secrets of their success. The church of to-day has no greater difficulties with which to contend and it ought to find in this book the inspiration for its immediate conquest of the world.

3. *As a Manual of Revivals.* This book is the best manual on revivals ever written. All the factors necessary for the world's evangelization are presented here. The Lord living and active in behalf of his own, the Omniscient and Omnipotent Spirit leading and illuminating all who are obedient to him, disciples testifying to that which they themselves have felt and known, conviction, enthusiasm, faith, and love—these won their way through the ancient world, and these alone will win the modern world to the Christian standard of life. The book of Acts has all the abiding secrets of success in revival work: prayer, plain gospel preaching, the faithful presentation of the fundamentals of the faith, directness of aim, persistence of effort, the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When Henry Ward Beecher first went into the wilderness of Indiana to preach he found that he could not get any of his hearers either convicted or converted. At last he decided to study the book of Acts to see if he could learn from it the secrets of apostolic success, and by practicing the principles he found there he brought hundreds into the Kingdom. He was a famous evangelist in those beginning days, and he said: "I

owe more to the book of Acts than to all other books put together. I said to myself, 'There was a reason why, when the apostles preached, they succeeded, and I will find it out if it is to be found out.' I took every instance in the record where I could find one of their sermons and analyzed it, and asked myself, 'What were the circumstances? Who were the people? What did he do?' I studied the sermons till I got the idea. 'Now,' I said, 'I will make a sermon so.' I remember it just as well as if it were yesterday. There were seventeen men awakened under that sermon. I never felt so triumphant in my life. I cried all the way home. I said to myself, 'Now I know how to preach.' "

There are ten great sermons in this book, and they are all worthy of careful study. Five are by Peter, one by Stephen, and four by Paul, and they show clearly all the essentials of apostolic preaching. They all have one theme, variously presented, but with unfailing results. In one of Dwight L. Moody's last addresses he said: "In my forty years of observation I have concluded that the nearer we get to the apostolic spirit and methods the more power we will have in our preaching. . . . These apostles and preachers were just witnesses. Twenty-three times in this book we find that word 'witness.' A witness just tells what he knows. A witness does not need to be eloquent. Let him try his powers of oratory on the judge, and the judge will set him down quick. 'We pay the lawyers to do that,' he will say. 'You just tell us what you know.' They witnessed to the Lord's resurrection twenty-nine times in the record of this book, and they witnessed to their own salvation; and the Holy Spirit honored their testimony in the conversion of other souls." The examples of conversion in this book are all notable and worthy of careful examination. Note the three thousand at Pentecost,[40] the Samaritans,[41] the Ethi-

[40] Acts 2. 36-47.
[41] Acts 8. 12.

opian eunuch,[42] Saul,[43] Cornelius and his household,[44] Lydia,[45] The Philippian jailer,[46] and Crispus and the Corinthians.[47]

4. *As a Biography of Paul.* Next to the one great biography of the Gospels, the biographies of this book are most cherished in the memories and hearts of the Christian world; and chief among these is the biography of Paul. His life is one of the great epics of biography, an Iliad and Odyssey combined, a life of constant wandering, constant conflict, and constant victory. There is no Anabasis in it from beginning to end, no retreat; but wherever the Greek tongue was spoken and there were souls to be reached and helped and saved, over the rivers, the continents, the seas, Paul went to labor and preach. He was an ambassador from heaven. The love of Christ was as a fire within his bones, constraining him to push on and on and ever on in his flaming evangelism. He was the advocate of Christianity before the bar of the world. Before the Jewish Sanhedrin, on the Athenian Areopagus, in the imperial courtroom at Rome, he was equally at home. Born a Jew in a Greek city as a Roman citizen, the world was his parish and its conversion his one aim in life. He preached by day and he labored by night. He founded churches here and there and everywhere. He laid broad and deep the foundations of a Christian empire which was destined to reach beyond the bounds of the empire of Rome.

He was a seer of visions and an organizer of churches, an idealist and a realist combined, a most strange and unusual combination. He was Christianity's greatest theologian and the world's greatest missionary. He gave a systematic theology to the infant church; and he gave an organized and established church to the Græco-Roman world. With a genius unsurpassed in his time and with an endurance

[42] Acts 8. 27-40.
[43] Acts 9. 1-19.
[44] Acts 10. 1-48.
[45] Acts 16. 14-16.
[46] Acts 16. 25-34.
[47] Acts 18. 8.

unparalleled by any missionary or itinerant, his lifework is the marvel of church history, his life achievement stands preeminent, like Mount Shasta towering above the plain, unapproached in his grandeur and alone on his throne. We cannot be too thankful to Luke that he has devoted more than half his book to the biography of this man.

III. Noticeable Features of the Book

1. *Omissions.* The book of the Acts covers a period of approximately thirty years, but it does not pretend to be a complete church history for this time. It necessarily is of a somewhat fragmentary character. The author has made a selection of incidents out of a multitude which he doubtless had at hand. John declares that there were many other things which Jesus did, but which John left unrecorded in his Gospel, "the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written."[48] Luke must have been embarrassed with a corresponding richness of material both in the lives and the sayings of his heroes. Yet some of his omissions are most remarkable.

(1) We have noticed that "The Acts of the Apostles" almost wholly ignores the missionary labors and successes of the apostolic twelve. We know that they and the brethren of the Lord went on missionary journeys, accompanied by their sisters or wives.[49] Tradition tells us that Thomas preached the gospel in India, that Peter founded the church in Rome, and that all the apostles were active in the gospel propaganda of the first century; but Luke is silent upon this theme. Apocryphal Acts of Thomas, of John, of Andrew, and others were early current in the church, evidently composed with the intention of making good this strange omission on the part of the evangelist; but their absurd fabrications make us regret all the

[48] John 21. 25.
[49] 1 Cor. 9. 5.

more that Luke has not chosen to give us authentic information concerning these things. We would like to know something about the origin of the New Testament literature. Luke ignores all the literary activity of the early church. If he had told us, for instance, whether Matthew wrote all of our first Gospel or only the sayings of Jesus to be found in it, how much of the discussion and the investigation of these later years might have been avoided!

(2) Mary the mother of Jesus is mentioned in the first chapter of this book, but Luke leaves her there on her knees in prayer with the disciples.[50] He gives us no further information concerning her. He knew more, but he has not recorded it. All the Mariolatry of the after ages might have been forestalled if he had told us all he knew. How long did she live? Where did she live? Where and when and how did she die? We wish we knew. Luke knew, but he does not tell us.

(3) Luke leaves the biography of Peter unfinished. When did Peter leave Jerusalem? Where did he go, to Rome or to Babylon, to the West or to the East? When and where was he martyred? Luke must have known these things. He has chosen not to record them in this book.

(4) Luke devotes so large a portion of this book to the history of Paul and his missionary companions, and yet among them he tells us nothing of Titus, who was one of the most faithful and serviceable of them all. We learn from other sources that this companion of Paul was a man of resolute will and great tact in dealing with difficulties which milder and less capable spirits would not venture to face, and that Paul fell back upon his energy and wisdom again and again. Strangely enough, Luke does not even mention his name.

(5) One of the most remarkable omissions in the entire narrative is the omission of any mention of the epistles of

---

[50] Acts 1. 14.

Paul. If these epistles had perished, we never would have known from this book that Paul had written any. These epistles bulk so large in our New Testament. They fill very nearly the same space in it as do Luke's two volumes of church history. Together with these they make up more than half of the book. Yet Luke makes no use of these epistles, and he never mentions one of them. They seem so important to us that it is difficult for us to see how Luke could have written so much about Paul and yet never have suggested that he made use of his pen as well as his tongue in behalf of the faith.

(6) When we turn to these epistles of Paul we learn from scattered allusions in them that Luke has given us only an outline, a suggestion, of the manifold and marvelous adventures of Paul. Paul was scourged on five different occasions by the Jews; Luke fails to tell us of any of them. Paul was beaten three times by the Roman lictors; Luke tells us of only one of these. Paul was imprisoned seven times; Luke tells us of only two imprisonments. Paul was shipwrecked four times at least; Luke tells us of but one shipwreck, and that the last, on the voyage to Rome. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians Paul mentions whole classes of hardships which he had undergone for the sake of the gospel, perils from rivers and from robbers and from false brethren, hunger, thirst, fasting, and nakedness in the wilderness;[51] and none of these things are even mentioned by Luke. There is so much of Paul's biography which Luke omits. What was the date of his birth? How old was he when he was converted? Was he a married man, a widower, or a voluntary celibate? These personal details are all interesting to us, and Luke could have settled these questions forever by a few added words. He is silent at all these points.

(7) The narrative closes with unexpected abruptness.

---

[51] 2 Cor. 11. 23-27.

We are told that Paul lived for two years at Rome and preached without hindrance, and then we are told no more. There are so many questions we would like to ask at this point. What did Paul say in his sermons at Rome? Not a single sentence from that rich treasure does Luke give us. We know more about Paul's preaching for a single day in Athens or a few weeks in Thessalonica or a few months in Galatia than we do about this two years of ministry in the world capital. Was Paul released from his imprisonment? Did he visit Asia Minor again? Did he make the intended missionary journey to Spain? Did he pass through the Pillars of Hercules and up the coast beyond to the British Isles and the northern "extremities of the earth," as some so fondly claim? Did Peter and Paul meet in Rome? Did they both suffer martyrdom in that city? What fierce debates have been waged over these questions! The uncertainty which surrounds them to this day illustrates the importance of Luke's narrative. We feel that we can rely upon anything he tells us; but when he is silent we are wholly at a loss and have no sure way out of the labyrinth of our own questioning.

(8) The book of the Acts is a history of the founding of the Christian Church, yet what notable omissions there are in that history! Nothing is told us about the founding of the church in the farther East. Nothing is told us about the founding of the church at Rome. No mention is made of the church in Egypt. The church in Alexandria played such an important part in the later history that we would like to know something about its beginnings. Luke is silent upon these themes.

(9) There are so many things concerning the constitution of the church and its modes of worship which Luke might have told us but which he has omitted. All of the various forms of church organization which have evolved in the course of the centuries are prone to claim apostolic authority, though they may be as far removed from each other as

hierarchy from democracy. Just a few words from Luke might have settled many of these differences forever. Some may be glad that he did not write them, while others would prefer that the agelong controversies upon these points could have been avoided.

Luke must have known about all of these things. Why has he chosen not to tell us of them? Several reasons have been suggested. The outbreaking of the Neronian persecution, which made it dangerous for a man to indulge in authorship of this character, may have prevented Luke from finishing his task. After the death of the apostle Paul he may have found himself thrust out into such continuous evangelistic labors that he had no further leisure for literary work of any kind. His own imprisonment and martyrdom may have been responsible for the sudden close of his book. Jülicher seems content with the suggestion that the book of Acts is exactly the size of the Gospel according to Luke, and that Luke, the author of both, was satisfied with his second work when it had reached the magnitude of the first, and so, impelled by a sense of proportion, was content to quit at that point.[52] This seems to us rather inadequate as an explanation.

We think Luke surely must have intended to continue his narrative. He may have planned a third volume to crown his historical series. He may have intended to add to this second volume, as events developed, the account of further triumphs or final martyrdoms. We do not know, but we are inclined to believe that Hase is justified in saying: "For a genuine historian no other end of the book is to be thought of than the martyrdom of Paul, as the Gospel had closed with the crucifixion of the Lord. Whether this close was early lost, or the author was somehow hindered from writing it, is one of the secrets of the past. I say, however, ideally, in the mind of the author, another ending has ex-

[52] Einleitung, S. 362.

isted." Balmer, Bertrand, Bleek, Burkitt, Credner, Ewald, Meyer, Rackham, Ramsay, Spitta, Zahn, and many others agree.

There were most thrilling events in the years immediately succeeding the close of the book of Acts. There were Paul's trial at Rome, a hearing before the emperor himself, and possibly an acquittal by the imperial court. Luke has told us so fully about Paul's trials before subordinate officials; what a climax to this series would be found in Paul's final defense and final victory! There was the martyrdom of James, the brother of the Lord. Then came the outbreak of the first imperial persecution and the martyrdom of both Peter and Paul. Then Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed and the Christian Church was finally freed from all Jewish ritual of worship and all restricting ties to Palestine. Luke knew of all these things and he had a historian's interest in them. He surely must have intended to chronicle them at some later time. As it stands our book of Acts seems surprisingly incomplete.

There is one unfinished book in our Bible, and only one. In the Old Testament the books of the Law are complete. The prophets fulfilled their mission with word and pen. The Psalmbook is a perfect whole. So are Job, and Proverbs, and every other book. In the New Testament the four Gospels complement each other and give us the perfect picture of the Lord. The epistles meet the several emergencies which occasioned them. The Apocalypse ends the volume symmetrically, and is itself a literary gem. Whatever the reason may be, there is one unfinished book in the Bible. It is the book of Acts. The Acts of the Ascended Lord are still in process of consummation. The Acts of the Holy Spirit still go on. The Acts of the Missionary Church have new chapters added to them with each century. This book of the Acts of Jesus and the Spirit and the Church never will be finished through all eternity.

2. *Parallelisms.* It is a peculiarity of Luke's style that he

delights in personal contrasts. This was apparent again and again in the Gospel, where he placed in sharp contrast with each other the Pharisee and the publican, the good Samaritan and the indifferent Levite, Dives and Lazarus, Zacharias and Mary, Martha and Mary, Simon and the sinful woman, the penitent and the impenitent thief. In this book we have a yet larger illustration. "First there is a general parallel between the Gospel according to Luke and the book of Acts. After a prefatory sentence both alike begin with an introductory period of waiting and preparation, which is more or less in private.[53] Then comes a baptism of the Spirit,[54] followed by a period of active work and ministry. This is concluded by a 'passion' or period of suffering, which in each volume occupies a seemingly disproportionate space. The analogy here will appear more convincing as we follow the later chapters, but the main outline stands out clear. After early anticipation[55] and a detailed journey up to Jerusalem[56] with 'last words' of the sufferer,[57] we have the 'passion proper.'[58] And then in each case the book ends with a period of victorious but quiet preparation for a further advance, or another volume."[59]

Whatever may be thought of this parallelism between the two books written by Luke there can be no question about the parallelism inside the book of Acts between the narratives given of the acts of Peter in the beginning chapters and of the acts of Paul in the closing chapters of the book. Like Plutarch at a later date, Luke selects from the lives of his two heroes those incidents which are most nearly related to each other in outward semblance and in inner character.

---

[53] Luke 1-2; Acts 1.
[54] Luke 3; Acts 2.
[55] Luke 9. 51; Acts 19. 21.
[56] Luke 17. 11 to 19. 48; Acts 20 to 21. 17.
[57] Luke 20-21; Acts 20. 17-38.
[58] Luke 22-23; Acts 21. 17 to chap. 28.
[59] Rackham, Commentary, p. xlvii.

Peter is suspected of drunkenness[60] and Paul is accused of madness.[61] Peter said, "Silver and gold have I none." [62] Paul said, "I coveted no man's silver or gold." [63] Is Peter miraculously released from prison at Jerusalem by an angel?[64] Paul is miraculously released from prison at Philippi by an earthquake.[65] Does Peter begin his miracles of healing by the restoration of a man lame from birth?[66] Paul begins with the same miracle of healing a man lame from birth at Lystra.[67] Does Peter's shadow heal the sick?[68] Paul's handkerchiefs and aprons have the same healing power.[69] As Peter heals Æneas[70] Paul heals the father of Poplius.[71] The demons fear the name of Peter,[72] and they also fear the name of Paul.[73]

Over against the encounter of Peter with Simon Magus[74] we have Paul's encounter with Elymas the sorcerer.[75] Both raise the dead. Peter raises Tabitha from the dead,[76] and Paul restores Eutychus to life.[77] Peter is instrumental in the performance of a punitive miracle, when Ananias and Sapphira fall dead,[78] and Paul makes use of a corresponding power when he smites Elymas with blindness.[79] The first Gentile convert made by Peter was a member of the noble Cornelian house;[80] and the first Gentile convert made by Paul was a member of the noble Æmilian house.[81] Gamaliel's proposition concerning Peter[82] is paralleled with Gallio's treatment of Paul.[83]

---

[60] Acts 2. 13.
[61] Acts 26. 24.
[62] Acts 3. 6.
[63] Acts 20. 33.
[64] Acts 12. 6-12.
[65] Acts 16. 26-34.
[66] Acts 3. 2-10.
[67] Acts 14. 8-10.
[68] Acts 5. 15.
[69] Acts 19. 12.
[70] Acts 9. 34.
[71] Acts 28. 8.
[72] Acts 5. 16; 8. 7.
[73] Acts 16. 18; 19. 11, 15; 28. 9.
[74] Acts 8. 18-24.
[75] Acts 13. 6-11.
[76] Acts 9. 36-42.
[77] Acts 20. 9-12.
[78] Acts 5. 1-11.
[79] Acts 13. 6-11.
[80] Acts 10. 1.
[81] Acts 13. 12.
[82] Acts 5. 34-39.
[83] Acts 18. 14-17.

Visions are granted to both these men, to Peter on the housetop at Joppa,[84] and to Paul on the road to Damascus.[85] The agreement in the narrative is all the more remarkable since the vision is doubled in each case, a corresponding revelation being given to Cornelius in the former instance,[86] and to Ananias in the latter.[87] We notice, further, that Peter hears the divine voice three times[88] and that the story of the threefold revelation is three times repeated in the book.[89] Paul likewise hears a voice from heaven three times[90] and the story is repeated three times in the book.[91]

Cornelius falls at Peter's feet to worship him,[92] and the same divine worship is proffered to Paul at Lystra and Malta.[93] Both Peter and Paul refuse the worship in strangely parallel phraseology.[94]

Peter has the power to give the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands in Samaria,[95] and Paul has the same power in Ephesus.[96] The same miracle, the miracle of tongues, follows in similar circumstances with Peter[97] and with Paul.[98] Both are persecuted by Sadducees and supported by Pharisees in the Council.[99] Paul adopts the language of Peter and Peter uses the language of Paul. We might increase this list of parallelisms, but it will be sufficient to quote Holtzmann's conclusion, based upon these and other passages: "Say what you will, the fact remains that in the Acts no single suffering or miracle of Peter is recorded which in its general character is not paralleled in the miracles and sufferings of Paul.[100]

[84] Acts 10. 9-17.
[85] Acts 9. 3-8.
[86] Acts 10. 3-7.
[87] Acts 9. 10-17.
[88] Acts 10. 16.
[89] Acts 10. 9-16; 10. 28; 11. 5-10.
[90] Acts 22. 7, 8, 10.
[91] Acts 9. 3-7; 22. 6-10; 26. 13-18.
[92] Acts 10. 26.
[93] Acts 14. 12-14; 28. 6.
[94] Acts 10. 26; 14. 15.
[95] Acts 8. 17-20.
[96] Acts 19. 6.
[97] Acts 10. 46.
[98] Acts 19. 6.
[99] Acts 5. 17, 34; 23. 6, 9.
[100] Hand-Commentar, S. 320.

Plutarch paralleled the lives of great men among the Romans and among the Greeks. He put them side by side and selected from their biographies those incidents which emphasized their likeness to each other, and the method resulted in some most surprising and most interesting contrasts and comparisons. In the same way it would seem that Luke had aimed to parallel Peter and Paul and to show that the leaders of the antagonistic elements in the early church, the Jewish and the Gentile elements, were alike in words and deeds, in aims and in accomplishments. The Tübingen School jumped to the conclusion that this parallelism was a pure invention and that it could not be founded on fact. We think otherwise. Genuine history sometimes has strange parallels in it.

Salmon has called our attention to one of these when he says: "On the principles of criticism by which the Acts have been judged, the history of France for the first half of the nineteenth century and the last years of the century preceding, ought to be rejected as but an attempt to make a parallel to the history of England one hundred and fifty years before. Both stories tell of a revolution, of the beheading of a king, of the foundation of a republic, succeeded by a military despotism, and ending with the restoration of the exiled family. In both cases the restored family misgoverns, and the king is again dethroned; but this time a republic is not founded, neither is the king put to death; but he retires into exile, and is replaced by a kinsman who succeeds, on different terms, to the vacated throne." [101]

There is the strange course of events in England beginning with the Roundhead Revolution and the beheading of Charles I, followed by the Commonwealth with the Rump Parliament, followed by Cromwell, and then the restoration of Charles II and James II his brother, followed by the crowning of William and Mary the daughter of James II,

---

[101] Salmon, Introduction, p. 311.

on the basis of the Declaration of Rights, affirming the ancient liberties of England. Who could have prophesied that one hundred and fifty years later the same general course of events would take place in the history of France, beginning with the beheading of Louis XVI in the French Revolution, followed by the Jacobins and the Reign of Terror, followed in turn by Napoleon the First Consul and then the Emperor, succeeded by the restoration of Louis XVIII and Charles X his brother, and then the July Revolution in which Louis Philippe was made the "citizen king," on the basis of an altered charter, putting the religious bodies on a level, granting the freedom of the press, and limiting the powers of the king? There the history stands and no one thinks of questioning its authenticity at any point because it becomes possible to point out this strange parallelism.

We recall another strange parallel in the lives of two Americans, Jonathan Edwards the father and Jonathan Edwards the son. Not only were their names the same and were they much alike in mental and spiritual characteristics, but also the course of events in their lives ran very strangely parallel. Both were tutors in the college where they had been students. Each of them was first ordained over a prominent church in the town where his maternal grandfather had been the pastor. Both were dismissed on account of doctrinal opinions. Each then became minister of a retired parish. Both were called from their temporary obscurity to the presidency of a college. Each died at the age of about fifty-five years, soon after his inauguration. On the first Sabbath of the January preceding their death, each of them preached from the text, "This year thou shalt die." Will the critic of future days come upon this parallelism and decide that it must be a pure invention and that no father and son ever could have had such strangely parallel careers? There are no parallels in the book of Acts any more wonderful than these, and we are not

inclined to doubt their historicity on the sole ground of their similarity.

3. *Accuracy.* A third noticeable feature of this book is the historical accuracy it has been shown to possess by all authority which can be cited from the ancient world. On this point Rackham has said: "We shall be abundantly satisfied as to Luke's historical accuracy, if we reflect on the extraordinary test to which it was put, *i. e.,* the variety of scene and circumstance with which he had to deal. The ground covered reached from Jerusalem to Rome, taking in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. In that field were comprised all manner of populations, civilizations, administrations—Jewish and Oriental life, Western civilization, great capitals like Antioch and Ephesus, Roman colonies, independent towns, Greek cities, 'barbarian' country districts. The history covers a period of thirty years which witnessed in many parts great political changes. Provinces like Cyprus and Achaia were being exchanged between the emperor and the senate; parts of Asia Minor, *e. g.,* Pisidia and Lycaonia, were undergoing a process of annexation and latinization; Judæa itself was now a Roman province under a procurator, now an independent state under a Herodian king. Yet in all this intricacy of political arrangement Luke is never found tripping. . . . He is equally at home with the Sanhedrin and its parties, the priests and temple guard, and the Herodian princes at Jerusalem, with the proconsuls of Cyprus and Achaia, the *rulers of the synagogue* and *first men* of Antioch in Pisidia, the *priest of Zeus* at Lystra, the *prætors, lictors* and *jailer* of Philippi, the *politarchs* of Thessalonica, the *Areopagus* of Athens, the *Asiarchs* with the *people, assembly* and *secretary* of Ephesus, the *centurions, tribune* and *procurator* of Judea, the *first man* of Malta and the *captain of the camp* at Rome. Such accuracy would have been almost impossible for a writer compiling the history fifty years later." [102]

[102] Rackham, Commentary, p. xlv.

It is at this point that Luke's reputation has been gaining steadily through the last half century. His accuracy used to be questioned, even when it was not strenuously denied, by many of the best authorities; but the investigations of Lightfoot and Ramsay and Vigoroux have gone far to establish Luke's unfailing accuracy in geographical and political and social data. If at one or two points Luke still seems to be at variance with other ancient authorities, his proved consistency and carefulness as a historian leads us to hope and believe that with added knowledge on our part his accuracy may be vindicated even to the last degree. Strabo said that the rulers of Cyprus were called proprætors. Therefore when Luke said that Sergius Paulus was proconsul in Cyprus the older commentators decided at once that Luke had made a mistake in this title; but in our own day Cesnola has found a coin in his excavations in Cyprus with the name of Paulus the proconsul upon it. Inasmuch as the coin was made in the days of the Emperor Claudius, and inasmuch as Paul visited Cyprus during this emperor's reign, it may be the name of Sergius Paulus himself which appears upon this coinage. At any rate, this coin has proved that Luke was correct in the use of the title.

Luke speaks of the politarchs at Thessalonica.[103] This name was not to be found in ancient literature. Therefore it used to be cited as a proof that Luke had extraordinary powers of invention rather than those of accurate observation. Yet all the time the critics were assailing Luke at this point a Roman triumphal arch was standing in Thessalonica itself on which the title politarchs was engraved in large letters. The arch probably was erected in the first century after Christ. It was destroyed by the Turks, but the British Consul rescued the block containing this title and the list of the politarchs with it, and it is now one of the treasures of the British Museum. More recently the title has been found on no less than nineteen inscriptions in Macedonia

[103] Acts 17. 6.

and all scholars recognize it as a title peculiar to Macedonian use and most accurately reported by Luke.[104]

Luke calls the governor of Malta the Primus, or chief man.[105] The scholars could not find this name anywhere, and they were sure that Luke had made another mistake in the use of this title. However, an ancient inscription has been dug up in Malta with this title upon it; and Luke's accuracy has been vindicated at this point. Luke describes Philippi as a chief city of the μερίς of Macedonia.[106] Here was a new name for a district or province, and even Westcott and Hort concluded that Luke was in error in using it, and they have marked it as a doubtful reading in their text. However, since their death some ancient Macedonian coins have been discovered with this word upon them, and certain documents have been found in the Fayum proving beyond a doubt that Luke's technical term is a legitimate one and one particularly associated with Macedonia.[107]

Luke never mentions the epistles of Paul, and yet Luther called the book of Acts a commentary upon these epistles. They give us the historical setting for all of them except the Pastoral Epistles and the volume of undesigned coincidences between the historical narrative of Luke and the private and the public letters of Paul go a great way toward establishing the authenticity and the reliability of both. Paley's Horæ Paulinæ is the classic presentation of the argument founded upon these coincidences.

Luke's accuracy in general and in minor details can be well tested in the chapter in which he gives the account of the voyage to Rome and of Paul's shipwreck on the island of Malta. Breusing, director of the naval academy in Bremen, in his volume, *Die Nautik der Alten,* declares: "The most valuable nautical document preserved to us from an-

[104] Burton, American Journal of Theology, vol. ii, pp. 598-632.
[105] Acts 28. 7.
[106] Acts 16. 12.
[107] Hogarth, Authority and Archæology, pp. 349-350.

tiquity is the description of the sea journey and shipwreck of the apostle Paul. Every seaman recognizes at once that it must have been written by an eyewitness." [108] Schaff agrees: "It contains more information about ancient navigation than any work of Greek or Roman literature, and betrays the minute accuracy of an intelligent eyewitness, who, though not a professional seaman, was very familiar with nautical terms from close observation. He uses no less than sixteen technical terms, some of them rare, to describe the motion and management of a ship, and all of them most appropriately; and he is strictly correct in the description of the localities at Crete, Salmone, Fair Havens, Cauda, Lasea and Phœnix (two small places recently identified), and Melita (Malta), as well as the motions and effects of the tempestuous northeast wind called Euraquilo in the Mediterranean." [109]

James Smith was the commodore of the Royal Northern Yacht Club. He was a scholar but not a professional theologian. He sailed over the course of Paul's voyage and by a multitude of minute coincidences he was convinced of Luke's faithfulness to the truth throughout. Even the soundings and the nature of the sea bottom off Point Koura in the island of Malta confirmed Luke's account of the shipwreck. Smith published his findings in a volume, The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul. The book has gone through several editions and is an authoritative presentation of the facts in this field.

All that Luke tells us of Gamaliel, Agrippa I, Agrippa II, Bernice, Drusilla, Felix, Festus, Gallio, Sergius Paulus and other historical personages is confirmed by all we can learn concerning them in any other way. His delineation of character agrees with that we can obtain from any reliable secular authority. One hundred and ten persons are named in the book of Acts and Luke has made their characters vivid

[108] *Op. cit.*, S. xiii.

[109] Schaff, *op. cit.*, pp. 736, 737.

and individual. They are more than names. They are personalities. The scenes in which they move are true to life and the opinions and positions they represent are always those of their own day and general situation. There are no anachronisms either in their thought or their historical setting. Luke's accuracy would seem to be attested sufficiently by ancient histories, coins, and inscriptions, as well as by the most searching geographical, topographical, and nautical investigation. His critics have alleged many errors against him, but again and again these errors have been proved to be those of the critics themselves. Luke is to be judged by the standard of his day rather than by that of our own, but, judged by this standard, he compares favorably with the greatest and best of the ancient historians.[110]

IV. Author and Sources of Information

Dr. J. Rendel Harris estimates the results of recent criticism upon the authorship of the book of Acts as follows: "Thanks to the acuteness of Ramsay's archæological and historical criticism, taken along with the linguistic researches of Hawkins, the studies in medical language of Hobart, and, finally, the weighty and apparently unanswerable criticisms of Harnack (himself a convert from very different views of the composition of the Lucan writings), we are able to affirm Luke's rights over the works commonly attributed to him with an emphasis that has probably not been laid upon them since their first publication." [111] Luke's authorship of the book of Acts is denied by Baur, Clemen, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Jülicher, Königsmann, Knopf, Norden, Overbeck, Pfleiderer, Schürer, Spitta,

[110] Compare Kirsopp Lake on the "we-clauses," Dictionary of Apostolic Church, vol. i, p. 22. Also Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 298, "Judged from almost every possible standpoint of historical criticism it is a solid, respectable, and in many respects an extraordinary work."

[111] In The British Friend, April, 1913.

Soltau, Sorof, von Soden, J. Weiss, de Wette, Weizsäcker, Wendt, and Zeller; but it has been clearly proved by Blass, Credner, Harnack, Hawkins, Hobart, Klostermann, Plummer, Ramsay, Renan, Vogel, Bernhard Weiss, and Theodore Zahn that the Gospel and the book of Acts were written by the same man and have the same characteristics of spirit and style throughout and that these are the characteristics of Luke, and there is a growing inclination everywhere to accept the traditional authorship as most fully meeting all the demands of the case.[112] The Gospel and the book of Acts are too important in the New Testament literature, and Luke is too unimportant in the New Testament history for them to have been ascribed to him in the beginning except upon the best of evidence; and the most painstaking investigation in this critical age only confirms the judgment of the Fathers at this point.

Luke's name is not found in connection with the book of Acts in any uncial manuscript, and his name does not occur anywhere in the narrative itself, and therefore others have been suggested as possible authors, Timothy, Titus, Silas, and other companions of Paul; but the similarities of style and of structure between this book and the Gospel according to Luke have convinced the best of the modern critics of a single authorship for the two works, and Moffatt declares that the contrary hypothesis "should nowadays be decently interred under the epitaph, '*Non fui, fui, non sum.*'"

Therefore, recognizing Luke as the author, we conclude from the narrative itself that he was a hero-worshiper of the first order, believing, like Carlyle, that history principally and essentially was only the history of great men, and that The Acts of these creative days in church history could be presented best in the biographies of Peter and Paul.

[112] Kirsopp Lake, in the Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, vol. i, p. 20, concludes: "The traditional view that Luke, the companion of St. Paul, was the editor of the whole book is the most reasonable one."

Two thirds of the book are given to the biography of Paul, practically all of it after the first twelve chapters, and Paul is mentioned at least seven times in five of these beginning chapters.[113] In all probability Luke never would have written this book if he had not had such an admiration for Paul. To Luke Paul is a hero of the first class, and his life history is worthy of record together with that of the Master.

Luke must have been a man of open eyes and open ears, a man who carried a notebook and kept a diary. The "we sections," so called,[114] are extracts from his diary. Davidson says of these, "They are characterized by a circumstantiality of detail, a vividness of description, an exact knowledge of localities, an acquaintance with the habits and phrases of seamen, which betray one who was personally present." The accounts of the mission in Samaria, the election of the deacons, the martyrdom of Stephen doubtless were jottings in Luke's notebook, made in those days which he spent in the home of Philip in Cæsarea.[115] He may also have met Cornelius there and heard from his own lips his wonderful story. Some of these things he saw and some he heard from the mouths of principal actors or eyewitnesses, such as Paul and his companions, Aristarchus, Erastus, Silas, Sopater, Timothy, Titus, Trophimus, and Tychicus, and such as Barnabas and John Mark and Manaen and Mnason and Symeon Niger and Lucius of Cyrene. Then there were the apostles James and Peter, and others whom Luke may have met, either at Jerusalem or at Rome. At any rate, he must have listened to the accounts given by many of the eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word concerning all of these events which he has recorded in the book of Acts. He had first hand and first-class authority for all his statements, and he has

---

[113] Acts 7. 58; 8. 1; 9. 1-30; 11. 25, 26, 30; 12. 25.
[114] Acts 16. 10-17; 20. 5-15; 21. 1-18; 27. 1 to 28. 16.
[115] Acts 21. 8-10.

weighed and sifted them with the care of a first-rate historian.

He also may have had access to some documents, as he had in the composition of the Gospel. It is acknowledged by all that there is a certain difference of style between the earlier chapters and the later chapters of this book. The prologue and the "we sections" are written in purer Greek. The earlier chapters are more Aramaic in character. Stated vaguely and generally this is true, and the more Aramaic character of the earlier portion of the book may be accounted for by the fact that Luke was more dependent here upon narratives already put into written form.

The Gospel according to Luke is the longest book in the New Testament. The Acts of the Apostles is next in size. It may be considered more important than the Gospel since it is the sole authority in its field. There are more textual variations in the book of Acts than in any other New Testament book. It is in this book that the Bezan or Western readings introduced the largest number of additions and changes. We are inclined to think that this book was given its final touches about A. D. 63, and that it therefore antedated the final editing of the Gospel.

We are thankful for all which Luke has written. It is an invaluable treasure. We are disposed to say that Luke is without a peer among historical writers, for he has described the most sublime life which ever appeared in the world, and then he has written a second book describing the origin and growth of the most powerful intellectual, moral, and social force which has influenced the world. No other historian has had access to the original sources for the delineation of such important themes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

We give an alphabetical list of a few good books on each of the fields of study covered in this volume, and we star some of the best of these.

I. Introductions to the New Testament

Adeney, Walter F. A Biblical Introduction, New Testament.
Allen and Grensted. Introduction to the Books of the New Testament.
Bacon, B. W. An Introduction to the New Testament.
Bleek, Friedrich. Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
Book by Book.
Books of the Bible.
Clemen, Carl. Entstehung des Neuen Testaments.
Cone, Orello. The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations.
Davidson, Samuel. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.
Dods, Marcus. An Introduction to the New Testament.
Eichhorn, Johann G. Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
*Farrar, Frederick W. Messages of the Books.
*Fraser, Donald. Lectures on the Bible.
Harnack, Adolf. Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200. Die altchristliche Literatur.
Holtzmann, H. J. Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
Jülicher, Adolf. Einleitung in das Neue Testament.
Martin, G. Currie. The Books of the New Testament.
*McClymont, J. A. The New Testament and its Writers.
Michaelis, Johann David. Introduction to the Divine Scriptures of the New Covenant.
Milligan, George. The New Testament Documents.
*Moffatt, James. Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.
*Peake, Arthur S. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.
Pullan, Leighton. The Books of the New Testament.
Reuss, Eduard. Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments.
Salmon, George. Introduction to the New Testament.
Sanday, W. Inspiration.

*Strong, A. H. Popular Lectures on the Books of the New Testament.
Von Soden, Hermann. The History of Early Christian Literature.
Weiss, Bernhard. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament.
Willett and Campbell. The Teachings of the Books.
*Zahn, Theodore. Introduction to the New Testament.

II. Commentaries on the New Testament

Cambridge Bible.
Cambridge Greek Testament.
*Century Bible.
Expositor's Bible.
*Expositor's Greek Testament.
Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.
Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament.
*International Critical Commentary.
International Handbooks to the New Testament.
Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament.
Schriften des Neuen Testaments.
*Westminster Commentaries.
*Westminster New Testament.

III. The Gospels

Baur, F. C. Die Evangelien.
*Burkitt, F. C. The Gospel History and its Transmission.
Cone, Orello. Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity.
Godet, Frederic. The Collection of the Gospels and the Gospel according to Matthew.
*Robinson, J. A. The Study of the Gospels.
Salmon, George. The Human Element in the Gospels.
Sanday, W. The Gospels in the Second Century.
Stanton, V. H. The Gospels as Historical Documents.
Weizsäcker, Carl. Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen und die Gang ihrer Entwicklung.
Wernle, Paul. Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Christ.
*Westcott, B. F. Introduction to the Study of the Gospels.
Wright, Arthur. The Composition of the Four Gospels.

IV. Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels

Abbott, E. A. Clue.
Bacon, B. W. The Beginnings of Gospel Story.
Buckley, E. R. Introduction to the Synoptic Problem.

Burton, E. D. Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem.
Carpenter, J. E. The First Three Gospels, their Origin and Relations.
Gloag, P. J. Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels.
Harnack, Adolf. The Sayings of Jesus.
Hawkins, J. C. Horæ Synopticæ: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Gospels.
Holdsworth, W. W. Gospel Origins.
Holtzmann, H. J. Die synoptische Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter.
Huck, A. Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien.
Jolley, A. J. The Synoptic Problem for English Readers.
Loisy, A. Les évangiles synoptiques.
*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem.
Patton, Carl S. Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.
Petrie, W. Flinders. The Growth of the Gospels as shown by Structural Criticism.
Rushbrooke, W. G. Synopticon.
Sanday, W. Survey of the Synoptic Question.
Life of Christ in Modern Research.
Scott-Moncrieff, C. E. St. Mark and the Triple Tradition.
Thompson, J. M. The Synoptic Gospels.
Volkmar, Gustav. Die Evangelien, oder Marcus und die Synopse.
Weiss, B. Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen.
Das Matthausevangelium und seine Lucas-parallelen.
Die Quellen des Lucas-Evangeliums.
Die Quellen des synoptischen Überlieferung.
Wernle, Paul. Die synoptische Frage.
Wright, Arthur. Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek.

V. Commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels

Bruce, A. B. Expositor's Greek Testament.
Cary, G. L. International Handbooks to the New Testament.
Holtzmann, H. J. Der Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament.
Weiss, B. Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament.
Weiss, J. Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments.
Wernle, Paul. Synoptische Frage.

VI. Commentaries on the Gospel According to Matthew

Allen, W. C. International Critical Commentary.
Broadus, J. A. American Commentary.

Carr, A. Cambridge Greek Testament.
Holtzmann, H. J. Hand-Commentar.
Kübel, Robert. Handbuch zum Evangelium des Matthaus.
*Morison, James, Practical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.
*Plummer, Alfred. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.
Slater, W. F. The New Century Bible.
Weiss, B. Meyer's Commentary.
Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Matthaei.
Zahn, Theodor. Zahn's Kommentar.
Zöckler, Otto. Lange's Bibel Werk.

VII. Commentaries on the Gospel According to Mark

Bacon, B. W. The Beginnings of Gospel Story.
Burton, E. D. Studies in Gospel of Mark.
Cook, F. C. Speaker's Commentary.
*Gould, E. P. International Critical Commentary.
Horton, R. F. The Cartoons of Mark.
Maclear, G. F. Cambridge Greek Testament.
Menzies, A. The Earliest Gospel.
Morison, James. Practical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark.
Plumptre, E. H. Ellicott's Commentary.
Salmond, S. D. E. New Century Bible.
*Swete, H. B. The Gospel according to St. Mark.
Weiss, Bernhard. Das Evangelium des Markus und Lukas, Meyer's Commentary.
Weiss, Johannes. Das älteste Evangelium.
Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Marci.

VIII. Commentaries on the Gospel According to Luke

Adeney, W. F. The New Century Bible.
Burton, Henry. Expositor's Bible.
Campbell, C. Critical Studies in St. Luke's Gospel.
Farrar, F. W. Cambridge Greek Testament.
Garvie, A. E. Westminster New Testament.
Godet, Frederic. Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke.
Hervey, Arthur. The Authenticity of St. Luke's Gospel.
Hobart, W. K. The Medical Language of St. Luke.
*Plummer, Alfred. International Critical Commentary.
Plumptre, E. H. Ellicott's Commentary.

Selwyn, E. C. Luke the Prophet.
Weiss, Bernhard. Meyer's Commentary.
Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Lucae.

IX. The Apostolic Age

*Bartlet, Vernon. The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity.
Dobschütz, Ernst von. Christian Life in the Primitive Church.
Harnack, Adolf. The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.
Hausrath, A. Times of the Apostles.
Heinrici, C. F. G. Das Urchristentum.
Lechler, G. V. The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times.
Lightfoot, J. B. Dissertations on the Apostolic Age.
McGiffert, A. C. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.
Neander, Augustus. History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church.
Pfleiderer, Otto. Primitive Christianity, Its Documents and Doctrines.
Purves, G. T. Christianity in the Apostolic Age.
Renan, Ernest. The Apostles.
Ritschl, Albrecht. The Origin of the Early Catholic Church.
Ropes, J. H. The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism.
Schaff, Philip. Apostolic Christianity.
Weizsäcker, Carl von. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.
*Wernle, Paul. The Beginnings of Christianity.

X. The Acts of the Apostles

Blass, Friedrich. Acta Apostolorum.
Bartlet, J. V. The New Century Bible.
Chase, F. H. The Credibility of Acts.
Clemen, C. Die Apostelgeschichte im Lichte der neueren Forschungen.
Forbes, H. P. International Handbooks to the New Testament.
Hackett, H. B. American Commentary.
Harnack, A. Luke the Physician.
The Acts of the Apostles.
The Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospels.
Hilgenfeld, A. B. C. Acta Apostolorum.
Holtzmann, H. J. Hand-Commentar.
Jones, Maurice. St. Paul the Orator.
*Knowling, R. J. Expositor's Greek Testament.

Lumby, J. Rawson. Cambridge Greek Testament.
Page, T. E. The Acts of the Apostles.
*Rackham, R. B. Westminster Commentary.
Ramsay, W. M. The Church in the Roman Empire.
St. Paul the Traveller.
Pauline Studies.
The Cities of St. Paul.
Luke the Physician.
Stokes, G. T. Expositor's Bible.
Smith, James. The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul.
Spitta, Friedrich. Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren Geschichtlicher Wert.
Weiss, J. Ueber die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte.
Wendt, H. H. Meyer Kommentar.
Zeller, Eduard. Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung untersucht.

The articles in Hastings's Bible Dictionary, Hastings's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Hastings's Dictionary of the Apostolic Age, Cheyne's Encyclopedia Biblica, the International Standard Bible Encyclopædia, and other general authorities may be consulted with profit.

I. INDEX OF NAMES

Abbott, 92, 165, 290, 338
Adeney, 337, 340
Adeodatus, 19
Alexander, 114
Alexander, Bishop, 262, 263
Alexandria, 116
Alford, 86, 165, 202, 290, 297
Alison, 192
Allen, 86, 95, 122, 124, 163, 294, 297, 337, 339
Ambrose, 166
Andrews, 235
Angelico da Fiasola, 122
Annas, 215, 239
Aretæus, 186, 197
Aristarchus, 178
Aristion, 168, 169
Ariston, 168
Athanasius, 116, 168
Athenæus, 197
Augustine, 85, 123, 124, 166, 181
Augustus, 215, 239
Ayles, 85, 95

Bacon, 294, 337, 338, 340
Balmer, 323
Bartholomew, 96
Bartlet, 341
Basil, 168
Bauer, 124
Baur, 124, 333, 338
Beecher, 315
Bellini, 122
Bengel, 86, 134, 165
Benson, 86
Bertrand, 323
Beyschlag, 204
Bloomfield, 86
Bickersteth, 165
Bisping, 165
Blass, 334, 341
Bleek, 86, 95, 124, 165, 204, 323, 338
Bloomfield, 86
Bonvicino, 122
Bossuet, 211
Box, 75
Breusing, 331
Broadus, 339
Browning, 263
Bruce, 45, 163, 339
Bruder, 158
Buckley, 338
Burgon, 165
Burkitt, 323, 338
Burton, E., 89, 331, 339, 340
Burton, H., 340

Calovius, 99
Calvin, 86, 184
Campbell, 150, 165, 337, 340
Carlyle, 265, 334
Carpenter, 339
Carr, 340
Cary, 339
Cave, 99
Cesnola, 330
Chase, 341
Chrysostom, 166
Claudius, 215, 330
Clemen, 333, 337, 341
Clement of Alexandria, 33, 116, 121, 124, 168, 303
Clement of Rome, 168
Cleopas, 183
Coleridge, 247
Cone, 337, 338
Cook, 165, 204, 340
Conybeare, 168
Cranmer, 184
Credner, 86, 87, 128, 165, 204, 289, 323, 334
Cyprian, 168
Cyril of Alexandria, 168
Cyril of Jerusalem, 85, 168

Da Costa, 130
D'Alembert, 241
Dante, 265
Davidson, 86, 165, 337
Deissmann, 179
Delitzsch, 42, 86, 124
Demas, 177, 191
De Wette, 86, 124, 165, 204, 334
Didymus, 166
Dionysius, 116

Dioscorides, 186, 197
Divina Commedia, 18
Dobschütz, 341
Dods, 86, 337
Dorotheus, 19

Ebrard, 95, 165, 202, 290
Edersheim, 165
Edwards, 328
Eichhorn, 165, 293, 337
Ellicott, 86, 165
Epiphanius, 85, 113, 116, 124, 166, 183, 196, 236
Erasmus, 86
Eusebius, 80, 85, 95, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 144, 166, 168, 169, 192, 246, 311
Evans, 306
Ewald, 86, 124, 133, 165, 204, 323
Ewald, P., 120

Farrar, 18, 21, 34, 79, 129, 139, 165, 202, 290, 312, 337, 340
Forbes, 341
Fraser, 43, 337
Fritzsche, 86, 124, 165

Galen, 186, 226
Garvie, 340
Gfrörer, 75
Gieseler, 289
Gloag, 202, 289, 339
Godet, 43, 72, 89, 95, 127, 165, 173, 202, 204, 290, 338, 340
Gould, 124, 165, 170, 290, 340
Gregory, 165, 168
Gregory of Nazianzus, 168
Gregory of Nyssa, 168
Grensted, 337
Griesbach, 124, 165, 174
Grotius, 99, 165
Guericke, 86, 165, 202, 290

Hackett, 341
Hamlet, 18
Harnack, 192, 217, 227, 228, 293, 294, 297, 333, 334, 337, 339, 341
Harris, 167, 333
Hase, 322
Hausrath, 333, 341
Hawkins, 80, 155, 287, 333, 334, 339
Heinrici, 341
Herder, 265
Hermas, 166
Herod Antipas, 23
Herodotus, 191, 311
Hervey, 340
Hilgenfeld, 86, 165, 204, 333, 341
Hippocrates, 186, 187
Hippolytus, 135, 136
Hitzig, 124, 165
Hobart, 226, 228, 333, 334, 340
Hofmann, 165, 202
Holdsworth, 87, 339
Holtzmann, 86, 95, 124, 165, 204, 293, 333, 337, 339, 340, 341
Homer, 177
Horne, 86, 202
Hort, 165, 166, 228, 229, 331
Horton, 159, 340
Huck, 339
Hug, 86, 95, 165, 173, 202, 204

Irenæus, 85, 121, 124, 166, 246, 303
Iverach, 283

Jackson, 13, 295
Jerome, 85, 116, 124, 168, 181, 192, 204, 246
Jolley, 339
Jones, 341
Jülicher, 17, 86, 96, 204, 294, 322, 333, 337
Justin Martyr, 120, 165

Kahnis, 124, 134
Keble, 188
Keil, 86, 95, 202
Keim, 18, 86, 95, 165, 204
Kiel, 165
Klostermann, 165, 334
Knowling, 342
Königsmann, 333
Köstlin, 86, 124, 204
Knopf, 333
Kübel, 340
Kuinoel, 165, 204

Lachmann, 124, 165, 289
Lake, 333, 334
Lamb, 265
Lange, 95, 115, 131, 134, 165, 202, 289
Lardner, 86, 202
Latimer, 184
Lechler, 341

Lee, 86
Lessing, 293
Lightfoot, 86, 165, 181, 214, 330, 341
Loisy, 339
Luckok, 115
Lumby, 202, 289, 342
Luthardt, 165
Luther, 177, 184, 247, 331
Lysanias, 215

Macarius, 166, 167
Macaulay, 311
Maclaren, 266
Maclean, 123, 124, 163, 165
Maclear, 340
Martin, 337
Matthæi, 165
McClellan, 165
McClymont, 337
McGiffert, 86, 341
Melanchthon, 184
Menzies, 340
Meyer, 95, 124, 134, 165, 204, 323
Michaelis, 89, 165, 173, 202, 204, 337
Mill, 165
Miller, 165
Milligan, 337
Milman, 288
Moffatt, 292, 334, 337
Moody, 134, 316
Moorehead, 93
Morison, 86, 121, 146, 165, 340
Moulton, 294

Neander, 311, 341
Nestle, 167
Nestorius, 166
Neudecker, 289
Nicephorus, 116
Norden, 333
Norton, 165, 289

Œcolampadius, 184
Olshausen, 86, 95, 115, 165
Origen, 84, 85, 116, 121, 246, 303
Overbeck, 333

Page, 342
Paley, 331
Pantænus, 85, 96, 116
Papias, 80, 85, 119, 120
Paradise Lost, 18
Patton, 297, 339
Paulus, 86
Paul Veronese, 36
Peake, 12, 13, 337
Petrie, 339
Pfleiderer, 333, 341
Philip, 215
Pilate, 158, 215
Plummer, 190, 204, 218, 223, 247, 263, 334, 340
Plumptre, 179, 290, 297, 340
Plutarch, 324, 327
Pullan, 337
Purves, 341

Quirinius, 215

Rackham, 323, 324, 329, 342
Ramsay, 179, 204, 217, 223, 323, 330, 333, 334, 342
Raphael, 140
Renan, 17, 96, 177, 204, 222, 224, 290, 334, 341
Resch, 165, 168
Reuss, 86, 124, 165, 204, 337
Réville, 87
Ridley, 184
Riggenbach, 128
Ritschl, 86, 124, 165, 341
Roberts, 86
Robinson, 164, 338
Ropes, 341
Rossetti, 189
Row, 290
Rushbrooke, 284, 339
Ruskin, 117

Salmon, 86, 124, 165, 170, 171, 172, 327, 337, 338
Salmond, 124, 153, 165, 340
Sanday, 95, 201, 204, 223, 270, 337, 338, 339
Schaff, 86, 131, 165, 184, 190, 191, 202, 216, 262, 290, 297, 311, 332, 341
Schenkel, 124, 165, 204
Schleiermacher, 165, 219, 293
Schmiedel, 296
Scholten, 124, 165
Scholz, 165
Schott, 86, 204
Schulthess, 174
Schulz, 165, 174
Schürer, 12, 333

Scott, 192
Scott-Moncrief, 339
Scrivener, 165
Selwyn, 341
Sergius Paulus, 107
Shakespeare, 177, 264
Slater, 340
Smith, 192, 332, 342
Socrates, 34
Soltau, 334
Sorof, 334
Spitta, 323, 333, 342
Stanton, 292, 338
Stevenson, 94
Stier, 165
Stokes, 342
Storr, 124, 165
Strabo, 330
Streeter, 139
Strong, 337
Stroud, 279
Stuart, 86
Swete, 165, 340

Tennyson, 147
Tertullian, 120, 121, 168, 303
Theodore, 19
Theodoret, 168
Theodoretus, 19
Theodorus Lector, 190
Theodosius, 114
Theophylact, 183
Thiersch, 86, 124, 204, 290
Tholuck, 56, 202, 204
Thomas, 20
Thompson, 284, 339
Thomson, 72, 86, 115, 130, 165, 202, 290
Thucydides, 191
Tiberius, 215
Tillemont, 99
Tischendorf, 86, 165, 171

Van Oosterzee, 216
Vigoroux, 330
Victor of Antioch, 123, 168
Vogel, 334
Volkmar, 124, 339
Voltaire, 241

Wace, 165
Warfield, 165
Warren, 116
Weiss, 21, 86, 89, 93, 95, 124, 140, 141, 165, 204, 290, 294, 334, 337, 339, 340, 341, 342
Weiss, J., 334, 339, 340, 342
Weisse, 124, 293
Weizsacker, 124, 334, 338, 341
Wellhausen, 294, 340, 341
Wendt, 290, 334, 342
Wernle, 338, 339, 341
Wesley, 177, 184, 310, 311
Westcott, 160, 165, 166, 228, 229, 279, 289, 297, 331, 338
Weston, 93
Wetstein, 86, 165
Whitefield, 184
Wieseler, 165, 202
Wilke, 86, 124
Willett, 337
Wilson, 217
Wolf, 165
Wordsworth, 165
Wright, 95, 124, 284, 289, 338, 339

Zahn, 13, 17, 18, 86, 115, 135, 158, 165, 168, 196, 294, 295, 323, 334, 337, 340
Zeller, 165, 204, 334, 342
Zöckler, 309, 340
Zwingli, 184

II. INDEX OF TEXTS

Exodus
4. 22, 23, 150
Numbers
12. 6, 77
Deuteronomy
23. 3, 6, 64
1 Samuel
28. 6, 77
Isaiah
11. 1, 40
Joel
2. 28, 78
Micah
5. 2, 40
Zechariah
4. 14, 304; 11. 12, 13, 46
Malachi
3. 1, 125
Matthew
1. 1, 39, 54, 206; 1. 17, 76; 1. 19, 47; 1. 20, 78; 1. 22, 44; 2. 1–12, 65; 2. 1–23, 76; 2. 2, 53, 55, 207; 2. 5, 46; 2. 6, 40, 45, 90; 2. 11, 54; 2. 12, 58, 78; 2. 13, 54, 58, 78; 2. 14, 54, 58; 2. 14, 15, 65; 2. 15, 44, 45; 2. 17, 44, 45; 2. 19, 20, 78; 2. 20, 54; 2. 21, 54; 2. 22, 58; 2. 23, 40, 44, 78; 3. 1–4, 11, 76; 3. 2, 51, 55; 3. 3, 45, 207, 271; 3. 5, 280; 3. 7, 68; 3. 9, 65, 69; 3. 15, 47; 4. 1–11, 76, 276; 4. 4, 46; 4. 5, 42; 4. 6, 46; 4. 7, 46; 4. 8, 83; 4. 10, 46; 4. 12, 58; 4. 12–17, 45; 4. 14, 44, 45, 62; 4. 15, 16, 90; 4. 17, 51; 4. 23, 51; 5. 1, 81, 278; 5. 3, 51; 5. 6, 47; 5. 10, 47, 51; 5. 14, 83; 5. 17, 40, 91; 5. 19, 51; 5. 20, 48, 51; 5. 21, 46; 5. 27, 46; 5. 31, 46; 5. 33, 46; 5. 34–37, 70; 5. 35, 42; 5. 38, 46; 5. 43, 46; 5. 45, 48; 5. 48, 250; 6. 1, 48, 50; 6. 1–18, 76; 6. 9, 50; 6. 9–13, 281; 6. 33, 48, 50; 7. 7, 76; 7. 7–15, 76; 7. 9–10, 249; 7. 11, 252, 306; 7. 14, 59; 7. 15, 62; 7. 17, 45; 7. 22, 76; 7. 23, 41; 7. 29, 56; 8. 1–15, 76; 8. 2, 136, 153; 8. 5, 281; 8. 10, 65; 8. 11, 12, 66; 8. 12, 69; 8. 16, 162; 8. 17, 44, 45; 8. 19–22, 249; 8. 25, 153, 279; 8. 27, 55; 8. 29, 55; 9. 6, 273; 9. 9, 22, 36; 9. 9–19, 22; 9. 11, 48; 9. 13, 31; 9. 14, 48; 9. 14–17, 77; 9. 15–17, 32; 9. 18, 281; 9. 18–33, 76; 9. 24, 53; 9. 27, 54; 9. 34, 69; 9. 35, 51; 10. 3, 20, 37; 10. 5, 6, 41, 215; 10. 9, 71; 10. 10, 280; 10. 37, 38, 77; 10. 41, 49; 11. 2, 62; 11. 10, 46; 11. 21, 66; 11. 23, 24, 66; 12. 1–14, 281; 12. 2, 48; 12. 3, 47, 54; 12. 5, 47; 12. 15, 58; 12. 15–21, 45; 12. 17, 44, 45; 12. 23, 54; 12. 24, 69; 12. 28, 50; 12. 38–42, 77; 12. 41, 42, 276; 12. 43–45, 60; 12. 45, 76; 13. 1–32, 77; 13. 11, 52; 13. 14, 44; 13. 15, 61; 13. 17, 49; 13. 16, 162; 13. 19, 51; 13. 24, 52; 13. 31, 52, 261; 13. 33, 52; 13. 35, 44; 13. 41, 41, 56; 13. 43, 49; 13. 44, 52; 13. 45, 52; 13. 47, 52; 13. 49, 49; 13. 52, 52; 13. 55, 162; 13. 58, 161; 14. 2, 280; 14. 5, 281; 14. 12, 62; 14. 13, 58; 14. 19, 271; 14. 23, 83; 14. 33, 163; 15. 2, 48; 15. 13, 60; 15. 21, 58; 15. 22, 54; 15. 24, 41; 15. 28, 65; 15. 29, 83; 15. 34, 76; 15. 37, 76; 16. 9, 163; 16. 12, 69; 16. 18, 67; 16. 19, 56; 16. 28, 148; 17. 1, 81, 281; 17. 4, 153; 17. 11–13, 62; 17. 15, 154; 17. 20, 83; 17. 23, 163; 17. 25, 70; 18. 1–4, 51; 18. 6, 10, 14, 77; 18. 12, 83, 248; 18. 17, 67; 18. 21, 22, 76; 19. 4, 47; 19. 17, 162; 19. 24, 50, 279; 19. 28, 42, 57; 20. 12, 13, 59; 20. 29–34, 282; 20. 30, 54; 20. 31, 54; 21. 1, 83; 21. 4, 44; 21. 5, 55; 21. 9, 55; 21. 12, 42; 21. 12, 13, 55; 21. 13, 46; 21. 15, 54; 21. 16, 47; 21. 19,

60; 21. 21, 83; 21. 31, 50; 21. 31, 32, 38; 21. 32, 49, 68; 21. 42, 47; 21. 43, 50, 60, 66; 22. 2, 52; 22. 9, 54, 66; 22. 14, 59; 22. 15–40, 77; 22. 19, 70; 22. 25, 76; 22. 31, 47; 22. 44, 271; 23. 2, 3, 41; 23. 13–36, 62; 23. 13, 69; 23. 15, 69; 23. 16–22, 70; 23. 21, 42; 23. 23, 69; 23. 25, 69; 23. 27, 69; 23. 28, 41, 49; 23. 29, 49, 69; 23. 33, 60, 68, 69; 23. 35, 49; 23. 38, 60; 24. 1, 60; 24. 3, 81, 83; 24. 11, 62; 24. 12, 41, 59; 24. 14, 51, 277; 24. 15, 42, 203; 24. 15, 16, 82; 24. 16, 83; 25. 1, 53; 25. 13, 258; 25. 31, 57; 25. 32–46, 62; 25. 34, 53, 57; 25. 37, 49; 25. 41, 53; 25. 46, 49; 26. 13, 51; 26. 22, 154; 26. 24, 45, 46; 26. 26–29, 277; 26. 30, 83; 26. 31, 46; 26. 39–44, 77; 26. 47, 136; 26. 52–55, 55; 26. 53, 57; 26. 54, 44; 26. 56, 44; 26. 61, 42; 26. 64, 55; 26. 69–75, 77; 26. 71, 282; 27. 4, 49; 27. 5, 58; 27. 9, 44, 46; 27. 11, 55; 27. 17, 22, 23, 77; 27. 19, 50, 65, 78; 27. 24, 50; 27. 28, 29, 55; 27. 35, 61; 27. 37, 55; 27. 39, 58; 27. 42, 55; 27. 45, 57; 27. 46, 58; 27. 49, 280; 27. 50, 57; 27. 51–53, 42, 57; 27. 62, 69; 27. 63, 69; 28. 1, 282; 28. 16, 82; 28. 18, 56; 28. 18, 19, 67; 28. 18–20, 77; 28. 19, 42, 62, 67

Mark

1. 3, 271; 1. 5, 126, 136; 1. 10, 130; 1. 12, 130, 131, 152; 1. 13, 137; 1. 16, 142; 1. 18, 130; 1. 20, 130; 1. 21, 45, 130; 1. 22, 139; 1. 23, 130; 1. 24, 152; 1. 25, 143; 1. 27, 139, 148; 1. 28, 130; 1. 29, 130; 1. 29–32, 142; 1. 30, 130; 1. 32, 33, 162; 1. 35, 132, 153; 1. 35–38, 152; 1. 36, 142; 1. 37, 136; 1. 38, 141; 1. 40, 136, 153; 1. 41, 161; 1. 42, 130; 1. 43, 130, 161; 1. 44, 136; 1. 45, 132, 136, 137, 161; 2. 2, 136; 2. 11, 273; 2. 12, 139, 149; 2. 13, 136; 2. 14, 137; 2. 14–19, 20; 2. 14–22, 22; 2. 18, 126; 2. 23, 136; 3. 1–26, 158; 3. 5, 138, 152, 153, 161; 3. 7, 58, 131; 3. 15, 158; 3. 16–19, 37; 3. 17, 120, 126; 3. 18, 20, 37; 3. 20, 129, 136, 152; 3. 21, 152, 156, 161; 3. 27, 136; 4. 1, 136; 4. 8, 137; 4. 11, 158; 4. 13, 162; 4. 15, 158; 4. 21, 128; 4. 26–29, 152, 156; 4. 31, 261; 4. 37–40, 153; 4. 38, 137, 153, 279; 4. 41, 139; 5. 7, 8, 273; 5. 9, 161; 5. 9, 15, 128; 5. 22, 137; 5. 23, 281; 5. 25, 26, 228; 5. 30, 161; 5. 41, 126, 137; 5. 42, 149; 6. 2, 139, 149; 6. 3, 125, 156, 162; 6. 5, 152, 161; 6. 6, 132, 138, 153, 161; 6. 7, 137; 6. 8, 71; 6. 8, 9, 280; 6. 16, 280; 6. 19, 158; 6. 19, 20, 281; 6. 22, 158; 6. 27' 128; 6. 30, 132; 6. 30–32, 153; 6. 31, 129, 131, 132, 152, 141; 6. 34, 138, 153; 6. 37, 128; 6. 38, 161; 6. 41, 271; 6. 46, 131; 6. 48, 161; 6. 51, 139, 149; 6. 52, 163; 7. 3, 4, 126; 7. 4, 8, 128; 7. 11, 126; 7. 19, 156; 7. 24, 131, 132, 161; 7. 28, 154, 249; 7. 31, 131; 7. 31–35, 152; 7. 32–37, 156; 7. 33, 138; 7. 34, 126, 137, 153; 7. 37, 149; 8. 2, 153; 8. 12, 138, 152, 153, 161; 8. 14, 137; 8. 17, 141, 162; 8. 18, 157; 8. 22–26, 144, 152, 156; 8. 23, 161; 8. 28, 142; 8. 29, 147; 8. 31, 141; 8. 33, 145; 9. 1, 148; 9. 2, 131, 132, 281; 9. 2–9, 153; 9. 5, 154; 9. 6, 146; 9. 10, 163; 9. 12, 161; 9. 16, 161; 9. 17, 154; 9. 21, 161; 9. 26, 162; 9. 30, 161; 9. 32, 163; 9. 33, 161; 9. 33, 34, 163; 9. 41, 158; 10. 3, 161; 10. 14, 138, 152, 153, 161; 10. 17, 138; 10. 18, 162; 10. 21, 138, 153, 161; 10. 22, 138; 10. 24, 139; 10. 25, 279; 10. 26, 139; 10. 32, 138, 139, 141; 10. 28, 136; 10. 41, 136; 10. 46, 126, 137; 10. 46–52, 282; 10. 47, 136; 10. 50, 139; 10. 51, 137, 154; 11. 1, 131; 11. 11, 132; 11, 12, 153; 11. 15, 138; 11. 17, 277; 11. 19, 132; 11. 21, 143; 12. 8, 151; 12. 12, 158; 12. 14, 128; 12. 15, 128; 12. 18, 126; 12. 36, 271; 12. 41, 137; 12. 42, 128; 13. 3,

126; 13. 3, 4, 137; 13. 10, 277; 13. 14, 158, 203; 13. 32, 152; 13. 33, 258; 13. 55, 156; 14. 5, 128; 14. 6, 141; 14. 12, 126; 14. 13, 114; 14. 14, 161; 14. 19, 154; 14. 22–25, 277; 14. 33, 138; 14. 34, 131; 14. 36, 126, 137; 14. 37, 146; 14. 40, 163; 14. 50, 141; 14. 51, 52, 115, 157; 14. 60, 139; 14. 65, 158; 14. 68, 137; 14. 69, 282; 14. 72, 158; 15. 6, 126; 15. 15, 128; 15. 16, 128; 15. 21, 137; 15. 22, 126; 15. 34, 126; 15. 36, 280; 15. 37, 57; 15. 39, 147; 15. 40, 20, 21, 137; 15. 42, 126; 15. 44, 158; 16. 2, 169, 282; 16. 7, 143; 16. 8, 167, 173, 174; 16. 9, 169; 16. 9–20, 164–174; 16. 17, 18, 167; 16. 19, 154; 16. 20, 148, 155

Luke

1. 1–4, 199, 287; 1. 3, 178, 217; 1. 3, 4, 217; 1. 4, 290; 1. 5, 217; 1. 10, 261; 1. 19, 209; 1. 26–38, 238; 1. 28–33, 261; 1. 46–48, 232; 1. 46–55, 261; 1. 52, 53, 238; 1. 64, 263; 1. 68, 253; 1. 68–79, 261; 1. 80, 199; 2. 1, 215; 2. 1, 2, 215, 217; 2. 4–7, 253; 2. 7, 238; 2. 8–20, 239; 2. 10, 207, 209; 2. 13, 263; 2. 14, 262; 2. 20, 263; 2. 21, 253; 2. 21, 22, 217; 2. 22, 253; 2. 22–24, 239; 2. 25–38, 239; 2. 28, 263; 2. 29–32, 214, 262; 2. 38, 253; 2. 40, 199, 253; 2. 41–52, 221; 2. 42, 217; 2. 42–46, 254; 2. 51, 254; 2. 52, 199, 254; 3. 1, 215; 3. 1, 2, 215, 217; 3. 3, 51, 280; 3. 4, 271; 3. 5, 6, 207; 3. 7, 68; 3. 11, 239; 3. 12, 20, 31; 3. 15, 225; 3. 18, 209; 3. 18–20, 217; 3. 21, 256; 3. 23, 217; 3. 23–38, 199; 3. 38, 40, 206; 4. 1–13, 276; 4. 8, 224; 4. 10, 263; 4. 16–30, 221; 4. 18, 195, 209, 224, 239; 4. 22, 210, 249; 4. 23, 224; 4. 24–27, 251; 4. 25–30, 207; 4. 29, 213; 4. 31, 206, 261; 4. 33–37, 200; 4. 38, 39, 226; 4. 43, 209; 5. 4–11, 219; 5. 5, 259; 5. 8, 9, 225; 5. 11, 240; 5. 12, 224; 5. 16, 256; 5. 24, 273; 5. 25, 26, 263; 5. 27, 19; 5. 27–39. 22; 5. 28, 36, 240; 6. 1–11, 281; 6. 11, 225; 6. 12, 13, 257; 6. 14–16, 37; 6. 15, 19, 20, 37; 6. 17, 278; 6. 17, 18, 224; 6. 20, 240; 6. 21, 47, 240; 6. 22, 48; 6. 24, 240; 6. 25, 240; 6. 35, 243; 6. 36, 250; 6. 39, 249; 7. 3, 281; 7. 11–15, 234; 7. 11–17, 202, 220, 224; 7. 16, 263; 7. 22, 209; 7. 36–50, 200, 221, 235, 244, 259; 7. 39, 225; 7. 41–43, 220; 7. 48, 210; 8. 1, 209; 8. 2, 3, 200, 233; 8. 3, 201; 8. 15, 249; 8. 24, 259, 279; 8. 28, 29, 273; 8. 38, 200; 8. 43, 228; 8. 51, 203; 9. 1, 224; 9. 1–6, 215; 9. 2, 224; 9. 3, 71; 9. 6, 209, 224; 9. 7, 280; 9. 16, 271; 9. 18–22, 257; 9. 26, 263; 9. 28, 203, 281; 9. 28, 29, 257; 9. 33, 259; 9. 46–48, 51; 9. 49, 200, 259; 9. 49–54, 221; 9. 52–55, 251; 9. 53, 213; 10. 1, 113; 10. 1–20, 183; 10. 8, 249; 10. 9, 224; 10. 25, 53; 10. 25–37, 220; 10. 30–37, 252; 10. 38–42, 200, 221, 234, 259; 11. 1–4, 257; 11. 2–4, 281; 11. 5–9, 258; 11. 5–8, 220; 11. 11, 12, 249; 11. 13, 252; 11. 14, 54; 11. 27, 200, 236; 11. 31, 32, 276; 11. 37–52, 259; 11. 51, 49; 12. 8, 9, 263; 12. 16–21, 220, 240; 12. 31, 49; 12. 35–48, 220; 13. 6–9, 220; 13. 10–17, 220, 224, 235; 13. 13, 263; 13. 19, 261; 13. 23–29, 251; 13. 31, 261; 13. 32, 201; 14. 1–6, 224, 260; 14. 1–7, 220; 14. 7–11, 220, 241, 260; 14. 12–14, 260; 14. 15–24, 260; 14. 16, 53; 14. 16–24, 220; 14. 21, 241; 14. 28–30, 220; 14. 31, 32, 220; 14. 33, 240; 15. 3–10, 220; 15. 10, 263; 15. 11, 53; 15. 11–32, 244; 16. 1–13, 220; 16. 16, 209; 16. 19–26, 226; 16. 19–31, 220, 240; 17. 7–10, 220; 17. 11, 19, 220, 224, 252; 17. 13, 259; 17. 15, 263; 18. 1, 258; 18. 1–8, 220, 234, 258; 18. 7, 258; 18. 9–14, 258; 18. 10–14, 220; 18. 15–17, 230; 18. 25, 226, 279; 18. 35–43, 282; 18. 41, 154; 18. 43, 263; 19. 1–10, 221; 19. 2–10, 244;

19. 6–9, 260; 19. 11–27, 220; 19. 37, 263; 19. 41–44, 254; 19. 46, 277; 20. 1, 209; 20. 36, 263; 20. 42, 43, 271; 21. 5–36, 202; 21. 8–19, 277; 21. 36, 249, 258; 22. 1, 206; 22. 17–19, 277; 22. 19, 248; 22. 20, 248; 22. 27, 242; 22. 31, 32, 145, 257; 22. 32, 104; 22. 40, 258; 22. 43, 255, 263; 22. 44, 224, 255; 22. 48, 255; 22. 50, 51, 220; 22. 51, 224; 22. 58, 282; 23. 5–12, 201; 23. 23, 213; 23. 27, 28, 236; 23. 27–29, 200; 23. 34, 257; 23. 40–43, 221, 244; 23. 43, 211; 23. 46, 57, 255, 257; 23. 47, 255; 23. 49, 200; 23. 50, 51, 242; 23. 56, 200; 24. 1, 200, 282; 24. 3, 249; 24. 10, 201; 24. 13–35, 202, 221; 24. 21, 253; 24. 23, 263; 24. 34, 248; 24. 30, 31, 260; 24. 39–43, 256; 24. 41, 225; 24. 47, 214, 251; 24. 52, 53, 226; 24. 53, 261, 263

John

1. 42, 19; 5. 17, 54; 6. 15, 58; 6. 66, 114; 11. 16, 20; 11. 35, 254; 12. 20, 183; 18. 10, 145; 19. 25, 21; 19. 30, 57; 21. 2, 20; 21. 25, 275, 318

Acts

1. 1, 304; 1. 13, 37, 303; 1. 14, 319; 1. 22, 143; 1. 26, 303; 2. 4, 308; 2. 13, 325; 2. 22, 23, 155; 2. 22–24, 143; 2. 32, 155; 2. 32–33, 304; 2. 32–36, 305; 2. 34, 155; 2. 36, 155; 2. 36–47, 316; 2. 38, 307; 2. 47, 263; 3. 1–12, 303; 3. 2–10, 325; 3. 6, 305, 325; 3. 7, 224; 3. 8, 263; 3. 9, 263; 3. 13, 151; 3. 16, 304, 305; 4. 27, 150; 5. 1–11, 325; 5. 15, 325; 5. 16, 325; 5. 17, 34, 326; 5. 34–39, 325; 5. 42, 305; 6. 3, 308; 6. 5, 192; 6. 5, 10, 307; 7. 55, 56, 305; 7. 58, 335; 8. 1, 335; 8. 5, 305; 8. 7, 325; 8. 12, 316; 8. 14, 303; 8. 17, 308; 8. 17–20, 326; 8. 18–24, 325; 8. 27–40, 317; 9. 1–19, 317; 9. 1–30, 335; 9. 2, 310; 9. 3–6, 305; 9. 3–8, 326; 9. 10–17, 326; 9. 17, 307; 9. 18, 224; 9. 31, 308; 9. 34, 305, 325; 9. 36–42, 325; 10. 1, 325; 10. 1–48, 317; 10. 3–7, 326; 10. 9, 10, 224; 10. 9–16, 326; 10. 13–16, 305; 10. 16, 326; 10. 26, 326; 10. 28, 326; 10. 36–40, 143; 10. 36–43, 305; 10. 38, 130, 308; 10. 44, 308; 10. 46, 326; 11. 5–10, 326; 11. 13, 306; 11. 19–30, 193; 11. 24, 307; 11. 25, 335; 11. 26, 313, 335; 11. 27, 193; 11. 28, 202, 215; 11. 30, 335; 12. 2, 303; 12. 6–12, 325; 12. 12, 99, 101; 12. 12, 25, 100, 102; 12. 13, 101; 12. 23, 224; 12. 25, 335; 13. 1, 201; 13. 1–3, 193; 13. 2, 107, 307; 13. 4, 307; 13. 5, 13, 100, 102; 13. 6–11, 325; 13. 7, 107; 13. 11, 226; 13. 12, 325; 13. 13, 102, 107; 14. 8–10, 325; 14. 12–14, 326; 14. 15, 326; 15. 1–3, 193; 15. 28, 307; 15. 30–40, 193; 15. 37, 100; 15. 37–40, 185; 15. 39, 100, 103, 111; 16. 6, 7, 305; 16. 10, 182, 305; 16. 10–17, 335; 16. 12, 331; 16. 14, 305; 16. 14–16, 317; 16. 18, 325; 16. 25–34, 317, 325; 16. 31, 305; 17. 1, 182; 17. 6, 330; 18. 2, 215; 18. 9, 305; 18. 8, 317; 18. 12–17, 180; 18. 14–17, 325; 18. 25, 310; 19. 6, 307, 326; 19. 9, 310; 19. 11, 15, 325; 19. 12, 325; 19. 23, 310; 20. 5, 6, 182; 20. 5–15, 335; 20. 9–12, 325; 20. 28, 307; 20. 33, 325; 21. 1–18, 335; 21. 8–10, 335; 21. 15–18, 182; 21. 16, 201; 22. 4, 310; 22. 7, 8, 10, 326; 23. 6, 9, 326; 23. 26, 194; 24. 3, 194; 24. 14, 310; 24. 22, 310; 26. 13–18, 326; 26. 22, 23, 305; 26. 24, 325; 26. 25, 194; 28. 6, 326; 28. 7, 331; 28. 8, 224, 325; 28. 9, 325

Romans

2. 16, 246; 2. 19, 249; 12. 1, 2, 150; 16. 8, 179; 16. 13, 127; 16. 15, 179; 16. 25, 246

1 Corinthians

9. 5, 318; 10. 27, 249; 11. 24, 248; 11. 25, 248; 13. 5, 111; 13. 13, 248; 15. 5, 248; 16. 5, 179

2 Corinthians
1. 9, 186; 8. 9, 238; 8. 18, 19, 183; 11. 23–27, 320
Galatians
2. 11–18, 104; 4. 13, 185; 6. 6, 291
Ephesians
4. 4–6, 248; 6. 18, 249
Philippians
1. 13, 181; 2. 7, 150; 4. 22, 181
Colossians
1. 10, 11, 249; 4. 6, 249; 4. 10, 100, 104, 178, 199; 4. 10, 11, 99; 4. 10–14, 191; 4. 11, 103; 4. 12, 179; 4. 14, 178, 179, 185, 199
1 Timothy
5. 17, 291
2 Timothy
2. 8, 246; 4. 10, 11, 178; 4. 11, 100, 103, 178, 182
Titus
3. 13, 179
Philemon
24, 100, 103, 178, 199
James
3. 9, 263
1 Peter
5. 10, 104; 5. 13, 100, 101, 103, 185
2 Peter
1. 18, 81
Revelation
2. 13, 179; 2. 17, 20; 3. 9, 93; 3. 17, 93; 11. 3, 4, 304

III. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Accuracy of Luke, 217–218, 329–333
Activity and rest of Jesus, 129–133
Acts of Paul and Thecla, 243
Adventures of Paul, 320
Angels, in Luke, 263–264
Apocalypse of John, 92–93
Apostle groups, 32–33
Augustine on Mark, 123, 124
Authorship traditional, sustained, 12–14

Barnabas, 193, 195
and Mark, 102
Bartimæus, 282
Beatitudes, 76
Benedictus, 282
Bible, a Jewish book, 205
Blind man cured, 144

Call of Matthew, 22–33
Catechism instruction, 290–291
Cathedral of Saint Mark, 117–118, 159
Catholicity of first Gospel, 17
Children, no, in John, 229–230
Church in Antioch, 192–193
Claudia Procla, 50, 79
Coins of Palestine, 71, 72
Colden, Cadwalleder, 24
Commission, the great, 42, 82–83
Complaint of Pharisees, 31
Contradictions in Synoptics, 280–282
Contrasts in Acts, 324
in Luke, 223
Conversions in Acts, 316–317
Cornelius, 143
Cowardice of Mark, 106–107
Crucifixion of Jesus, 57
Cry of dereliction, 58–59

Demas, 177
Denunciation of the Pharisees, 56, 60, 62, 68–69
Diminutives in Mark, 136
Disciples' Prayer, 75
Discourses, minor, of Jesus, 80
Documentary theory, 293–294, 296

Earliest and latest sayings of Jesus, 212
Educated leaders, 195
Epistles of Paul, 319–320

Faith of Gentiles, 65
Feast, Matthew's, 28–32
First and Second Gospels contrasted, 45–46, 160–163
First Gospel, unequaled, 18
Fool, the rich, 240–241

Gallio and Paul, 180–181
Genealogy of Luke, 206–207
of Matthew, 39–40, 53, 62–64, 74–75
Gloria in excelsis, 261
Gospels, primitive, 291–292
Graciousness of Jesus, 209–213

Healing of infirm woman, 229–230
Hebrew Matthew, the, 85–86
Hebrews, Epistle to, 91
Herod the Great, 53–54, 215
Holy Spirit in Acts, 306–308
in Luke, 252
Homesickness of Mark, 105–106
Humanity of Jesus, 253–261
Hymns in Luke, 261–263

Imagination, legitimate, 196
Importance of first Gospel, 17–19
Individual responsibility, 33–34
Inspiration not mechanical, 285–286

Jairus, 32
James, Epistle of, 92
James the Less, 20
Jealousy of Mark, 107–108

Jesus astonishing people, 148–149
authority of, 55–57
his disabilities, 161–162
his human emotions, 160–161
no respecter of persons, 27–28
Jewish priority, 41
John the Baptist, 31–32, 50, 62
Joseph, 47, 78
Joseph of Arimathæa, 242
Joses, 21
Judas, 38

Kingliness of Jesus, 54–55

Law and tradition, 41
Lord, the title, in Mark, 153–155
Lucanus the poet, 179–182, 187, 198
Luke and Herod's court, 200–201
and Mark, 200
and women, 200
the historian, 215–216

Magnificat, 261
Mark, his martyrdom, 116
his symbol, 105, 119, 151
stump-fingered, 100, 135
Mary and Martha, 211, 234
Mary Magdalene, 169, 233
Mary, mother of Jesus, 54, 231–233, 319
Mary, mother of Mark, 101
Mary, mother of Matthew, 20
Matthew, a new name, 19–20
meaning of name, 19
a man of means, 36
a modest man, 36–38
a pessimist, 35, 59–61
a publican, 23–25, 37, 68–72
Miracles in Mark, 144, 147–148
in Matthew, 73, 88
in Luke, 219–220
Modesty of Peter, 144–146

Nazareth, Jesus at, 209–210
Nicolas of Antioch, 192
Nunc Dimittis, 262

Oaths, 70–71
Odds against Christianity, 313
Oral Tradition Theory, 289–293, 296
Oriental memory, 290–291

Palsied man cured, 26–27
Parables in Luke, 220, 221
of the Kingdom, 52, 73
Parallels in history, 327–328
Paul and Luke, 226
and Mark, 103–104, 109–110
Pentateuch and Matthew, 42–43
Personality and authorship, 11–12, 83–85, 86–88
Peter and Mark, 101–102, 104, 120–123, 141–146, 185
Pharisee and publican, 37
Polemic in Matthew, 89–90
Politarchs in Macedonia, 330–331
Poverty of Jesus, 238
Prayer parables of Luke, 258
Prayers of Jesus, 256–259
Preface of Luke, 286–287
Prodigal Son, 210, 244
Program of second Gospel, 143
Prophecy, Old Testament, 40, 43–47
Psychologist, Luke as, 224–226
Publican, the Jewish, 23–25

Rahab, 63
Redemption, in Luke, 253
Relationships of Matthew, 20–21
Revelation in dreams, 77–79
Rome and Mark, 126–128
Rufus, 127–128
Ruth, 63–64

Samaritans and Jesus, 251–252
Scholasticism, 288
Seneca and Paul, 181
Serapis, 116
Sermon on the mount, 79, 278
Sermons in Acts, 315–316
Seventy sent, 214
Simon of Cyrene, 127
Social life of Jesus, 259–261
Social outcasts, 244–245
Son of David, 54
Sympathy of Jesus, 243

Table of Synoptic coincidences, 279

Temple tax, 70
Texts of Jesus, 51, 209–210, 239–240
Theophilus, 187, 194, 197
Thief, the dying, 211–212, 244
Thomas Didymus, 20–21, 37
Titus, 319
Tribute money, 70
Trust in riches, 241–243

Unclean meats, 156–157
Unfinished book, one, 323
Unity of authorship, 86–87
University at Tarsus, 186
Upper room, 114

Vegetarianism of Matthew, 33
Versatility of Luke, 199, 218
Vocabulary of Luke, 222–223, 250

Walk to Emmaus, 183
Woes unto the rich, 240
Woman who was a sinner, 210, 235, 244
Women in the genealogy, 62–64
Words of Jesus, 275
Widows, in Luke, 234–235
Wise Men, 53

Zacchæus the publican, 37, 211, 242, 244